## DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 051 254 TE 499 834

| | |
|---|---|
| AUTHOR | Eddy, Junius |
| TITLE | A Review of Federal Programs Supporting the Arts in Education. |
| INSTITUTION | Ford Foundation, New York, N.Y. |
| PUB DATE | May 70 |
| NOTE | 141p.; A report to the Ford Foundation |
| EDRS PRICE | EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58 |
| DESCRIPTORS | *Art Education, Creative Art, *Educational Legislation, *Federal Aid, *National Surveys, Teacher Education, *Theater Arts |
| IDENTIFIERS | ESEA Title I, ESEA Title III |

ABSTRACT

The ways in which public funds have been used to support activities dealing with the arts in general education and the creative and performing arts are examined. Topics covered include: (1) the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, (2) teacher education under NDEA, NFAHA, and EDPA, (3) other OE-administered legislation with limited applicability, and (4) programs administered by other agencies which support arts-in-education activities. The conclusions show that large sums of federal funds have been directed toward supporting the arts in education, including the creative and performing arts. The great bulk of this support came from Titles I and III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. (CK)

ED051254

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

BESE
T.H. III

TE/0

# A REVIEW OF FEDERAL PROGRAMS SUPPORTING THE ARTS IN EDUCATION

A Report to the Ford Foundation

by Junius Eddy

TE 499 834

May, 1970

## Contents

An Introductory Note . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . i

General Background . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 1

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 . . . . . 10
- Title I - Special Education Programs for Disadvantaged Children . . . . . . . . 15
- Title II - Instructional Materials and Library Resources 34
- Title III - Supplementary Educational Centers and Services . . . . 38
- Title IV - Research and Development . . . . . . . . . . 39
- Title V - (State Education Agencies) . . . . . . . . . . . 64

Teacher Education under NDEA, NFAHA and EPDA . . . . . 68
- NDEA . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 68
- NFAHA . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 69
- EPDA . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 72

Other OE-Administered Legislation with Limited Applicability . 82
- The Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 . . . . . . . 82
- The "Impacted Areas" Legislation . . . . . . . . . . . . 83
- The Vocational Education Legislation . . . . . . . . . . . 84

Programs Administered by Other Agencies Which Support Arts-in-Education Activities . . . 86
- The National Endowment for the Arts . . . . . . . . . . 87
- The National Endowment for the Humanities . . . . . . . 97
- The Office of Economic Opportunity . . . . . . . . . . . 106
- The Department of Housing and Urban Development (Model Cities) . . . 114

Summary: Problems and Prospects . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 116

References . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 137

## An Introductory Note

In broad outline, this report examines the ways in which public funds have been used in recent years to support activities dealing with the arts in general education. This much said, let me hasten to emphasize several qualifications affecting the scope of the activities under review.

The report is concerned primarily with the creative and performing arts and makes no direct attempt to deal with other subject matter areas often considered part of the "humanities curriculum"; although occasional reference is made to college-level activities, the study is limited to public education at the elementary and secondary levels rather than ranging across the entire spectrum of education; and it is confined primarily to a review of public funds which have been made available recently at the federal level of government rather than with the use of state and local funds. On the other hand, it deals with activities relating both to the general education of children in the arts and to the special needs and concerns of the artistically talented.

Most of these limitations have been incorporated for very practical reasons. Mainly, they relate to the fact that there is really little to study with respect to the use of public funds for these purposes at other levels of government and that, even at the federal level, legislation affecting the arts in higher education has been both minimal and hard to trace or identify. Individual grants, loans, or fellowships authorized under the Higher Education Act have certainly found their way to college and university students interested in the arts and humanities fields, but it is doubtful that the figure would mean anything much even if one knew how many students fell into this category or what percentage they represented of the total.

With respect to the phrase, "arts and humanities education," which is used rather often in the pages that follow, I should make it clear that I am referring to a rather special aspect of the humanities field. I am not -- as indicated immediately above -- referring to those aspects of the curriculum dealing specifically with such subjects as social studies, foreign languages, and much of the standard English curriculum. The latter, however, does fall within the domain of this study when it moves beyond the passive study of literature and into the realm of truly creative writing (in projects, for example, in which poets interact with students in the classroom). Furthermore, any of the interdisciplinary activities which attempt to link the study and practice of the arts with any of the standard subject matter fields (whether in the humanities or the sciences) must also be regarded as within our purview here. And finally, the increasing interest in utilizing the arts as motivational or learning tools in the acquisition of cognitive information or the development of academic skills cannot be excluded from our concern.

What I am saying, I think, is that I needed a phrase which would indicate the growing tendency in schools and among teachers to work in interdisciplinary ways -- not simply within the standard humanities subjects themselves, but with approaches which provide for interaction between these subjects and one or more of the creative or performing arts. Since the phrase "creative and performing arts" is simply not inclusive of such concerns, I felt the need throughout to keep referring to "the humanities" as my personal way of indicating these broader interdisciplinary concerns. This, then, is the reason why the phrase "arts and humanities education" (or similar references) keeps recurring in a report dealing primarily with the creative and performing arts in our schools.

The attempt has been made, in this study, to focus directly on the various legislative programs which, during the last five years, have supported such a wide variety of projects and stimulated so much activity in arts and and humanities education at the elementary and secondary levels. The scope of these programs, the extent of the interest in them on the part of artists and educators alike, the multitude of ways in which the funds were put to use in the states and localities, and the relative amounts of money spent in every instance -- these are largely the issues dealt with in the course of the report.

The approach is rather a personal one, since I spent most of the years under review in Washington, both observing the developments which led to the flurry of legislative enactments in 1965 and ultimately working directly with the resulting programs as an official of the U.S. Office of Education. The attempt throughout has been to try to put the facts, figures and statistics (as many as could be unearthed) into some kind of general perspective and see what kind of pattern emerged. Wherever possible, inferences have then been drawn which might help to illuminate what happened, what the present state of affairs seems to be, and what seems likely to happen in the immediate future, with respect to public funding for such purposes. Some of the implications this suggests for consideration by private institutions are the subject of speculation in the final section of this report.

Finally, it should be pointed out that Title III of ESEA is dealt with at greater length in a separate report. Logically, it would form a greatly extended middle section of the present report; however, because of the way in which Title III was implemented and reported, it lends itself rather more effectively to closer examination than any other major program. Furthermore, it seems to have stimulated the development of the most imaginative projects involving the arts, and therefore is perhaps more deserving of intensive analysis than any of the other legislative programs. And finally, it is interesting simply as an instrumentality -- unique in the history of educational legislation -- which made it possible, for a brief period of time, to explore new ways of involving the arts creatively in the nation's schools.

Thus: a separate report on Title III -- with everything else reviewed in the pages that follow.

## General Background

In a 1966 article entitled "Government and the Arts," a writer for The Reporter magazine estimated that under legislation administered by the United States Office of Education, something on the order of one hundred million dollars would be spent that year on programs and projects relating, in one way or another, to arts and humanities education.

Those of us working at the Office of Education at the time used to wonder a bit about that estimate; there was really no way of checking it out completely, because it covered expenditures from a score of separate programs; and there is always a time lag of a year to eighteen months in statistical reporting on U.S.O.E. programs nationally. However, I now believe that this $100,000,000 figure was reasonably accurate. If anything, it's somewhat low.

Had the estimate been made a year earlier, it would have been surprising if the figure had come to a fifth of that amount; furthermore, one major program -- the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 -- would probably have been responsible for most of the expenditure, in the form of grants and loans to higher education institutions for the construction of fine arts facilities of some sort. Most of the balance would have been the modest expenditures for educational research and development activities administered by the Arts and Humanities Program in the Bureau of Reserach. (In fact, this program -- established in 1962 as the Cultural Affairs Branch, to represent U.S.O.E.'s interest in such matters -- had never spent more than $725,000 in any single year prior to 1966.)

What made the difference in fiscal 1966, of course, was passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (known as ESEA). President Johnson signed it into law in September of 1965, and within a few months it began to pump unprecedented amounts of new federal money into the nation's schools. Of the nearly one billion dollars spent under ESEA titles in 1965-66 alone, about $75,000,000* appears to have supported projects and programs which -- if broadly interpreted to include activities listed as "Cultural Enrichment" -- dealt in some way with arts and humanities education. No doubt, if one were to scour the fiscal 1966 line-item budgets of other federal agencies (OEO, Labor, and other branches of HEW for example), one could probably un-earth several hundred thousand more dollars, perhaps as much as a million, which went for similar purposes. And in general, I think it is safe to say that in each of the three succeeding fiscal years (1967-69), the amounts spent on activities relating to arts and humanities education below the college level remained on this relatively high plateau. If higher education were included -- and particularly loans and grants for fine arts construction under the Higher Education Facilities Act -- the total expenditure in each of these years has probably exceeded $100,000,000.

There are several points that need to be made when one tosses around this kind of global statistic with respect to federal support of arts and humanities education. And I would like to mention them briefly before

* See Chart, page 119.

examining in some detail the major policies and programs involved.

First, it is perhaps obvious that none of the legislation now on the books (most of which contributed to the rough expenditure totals mentioned above) is aimed exclusively at supporting educational undertakings in the arts and humanities. In a publication dated December, 1968, the U.S. Office of Education lists and describes seventeen separate pieces of legislation which may provide support for the arts and humanities. Sub-divided further into specific titles, there are some 38 individual programs administered by the U.S. Office of Education which applicants could utilize in their search for funds. And that little word "may" is an all-important qualifier; theoretically, the entire appropriation for all 38 programs could be used to support arts and humanities education; in reality, for political, geographic and administrative reasons, the vast majority of these programs are used hardly at all for such purposes. The lion's share of the expenditures, since 1965 at least, has been derived from perhaps four or five programs.

While these four or five programs (primarily but not exclusively the several titles of ESEA) are the closest Congress has come to passing a program of general federal assistance to education, they are nonetheless regarded as "categorical" programs. Their stated purposes (such as improving the education of children from low-income families, for instance) are nevertheless broad enough to include support for activities in virtually every subject matter, training, and administrative field -- including the arts and humanities.

As indicated earlier, it was not always thus. Until 1964 -- when support for summer teacher training institutes under the National Defense Education Act was expanded to cover teachers of history, geography and English, along with media specialists and librarians -- virtually every piece of federal legislation supporting education at the pre-college level categorically excluded the arts and humanities. That is, with the single exception of the "impacted areas" bill, all of this pre-1965 legislation not only failed to be drawn broadly enough by its sponsors to include arts and and humanities education "in"; but, by specifically restricting itself to other instructional areas, such legislation also appears to have systematically discriminated against the arts and humanities. To date, in 1970, with the exception of a minor now-defunct section on teacher education in the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965, no bill has yet been introduced in Congress which has as its special categorical purpose the improvement of the arts and humanities in the nation's schools.

A second observation about this 70-75 million-dollar-a-year figure is that virtually all of it had to be applied for by local school officials. In essence, such applications represented an exercise in local option, a conscious decision on somebody's part to emphasize the arts, the humanities, and cultural activities generally as against other kinds of educational programs in a given school system. Although the ESEA legislation didn't exclude the arts and humanities, as the NDEA did with its categorical emphasis on mathematics, sciences and foreign languages, neither did it single out the arts for special consideration. Schoolmen were thus faced with a wide range of possible uses for this new money and it is significant therefore that they chose to spend such large amounts of it for such non-utilitarian purposes. It is equally significant, I think, that administrators of these new programs, in the Office of Education and the state education agencies, felt some obligation to approve the spending of such sums in this manner.

Perhaps this is only a measure of the degree of neglect which the arts and the humanistic studies traditionally have suffered in the nation's schools. Perhaps the applicant educators and the agency program officers were making a conscious attempt to redress the long-standing curricular imbalance by directing such unprecedented sums of money to these humanistic purposes. On the other hand, they may simply have been performing in their traditional manner, since the percentage of total ESEA funds which was used for these purposes seems to have reflected the school's 'business-as-usual' norm -- about 8 per cent in fiscal 1966, and falling off steadily each year since.

A third observation -- and a rather obvious one -- is simply that, large as the dollar amount devoted to arts and humanities education may seem to be, it is considerably less than it might have been had ESEA received full funding from Congress during its first five years of operation. It is no secret that the amounts appropriated for federal programs -- and for education measures particularly -- are a great deal lower than the sums originally authorized. In education bills, the appropriations seem to run anywhere from a fifth to a half of the authorizations.

Charles Lee, the director of the national education lobby aimed at achieving full funding of the current education bill (HR 514), observed recently that the 1970 authorization for all titles of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act comes to a total of $5.4 billion. The amount actually appropriated this fiscal year is $2.3 billion -- considerably less than half the authorized amount.

Title III of ESEA -- the title supporting educational innovation, including some of the more imaginative arts projects—highlights this issue more dramatically still. In fiscal 1966, Title III's authorization was $100,000,000; the appropriation for it came to $75,000,000 -- a gap of $25,000,000. In fiscal 1970, however, this title was authorized to spend up to $550,000,000; the amount actually appropriated and spread among the fifty states for support of local projects is $116,193,000, only slightly more than a fifth of the authorized amount.

The importance of this point, with respect to arts and humanities education, is not much different from its importance to education as a whole -- with one exception. Increased expenditures affecting the arts in our schools have traditionally been a function of a loose rather than a tight budget and this seems to be true of decisions about public funds for education regardless of the administrative level involved. The old adage about the arts in education -- that they are the last to be included in budget increases and the first to be lopped off when budgets are being cut -- appears to hold up as effectively in a national program, spread throughout the fifty states, as it does in a local school system.

There are, obviously, many reasons why the appropriations for a program such as Title III (or for ESEA as a whole) fail to rise in accordance with their original authorizations. Most of the rationale is political in nature; some of it is economic. Whatever the reasons, however, when budgetary constrictions such as those affecting Title III appropriations come into play, the impact on expenditures supporting the arts and humanities is particularly severe. When risk money of this nature begins to dry up, at the source, other educational issues seem to take on an even greater urgency than would normally be the case. Not only are the arts and humanities therefore "the first to go" (in terms of fewer proposals submitted, fewer approvals, and smaller dollar amounts), the manner of their going seems to be a matter of geometric progression rather than merely a proportionate drop.

I will attempt to elaborate on each of these issues more fully later in this report.

Meanwhile, lest some of the foregoing facts have been obscured by qualifications and exceptions, what should be kept in mind is that:

* from virtually nothing in 1965, federal financial support for pre-college educational programs in the arts, the humanities, and cultural activities generally, leaped to

somewhere between 70 and 75 million dollars only a year later;

- most, though not all, of this amount came from legislation administered by the Office of Education -- and primarily from the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965;
- if higher education programs, notably the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, were included, the expenditure total for 1966 would probably top $100,000,000; and
- expenditures for these purposes -- at the public school level -- have generally remained at this level during the next three fiscal years (and, indeed, were considerably higher in 1967.)

It is too soon to make definitive statements about fiscal 1969 and 1970. The data for fiscal 1969 -- submitted by the state agencies in a new consolidated reporting form for all major education programs -- is still being analyzed and processed by the Office of Education. It is expected to be published by mid-summer.*

As for fiscal 1970, we are still several months from its end -- as of this writing -- and it will be at least another year before official figures become available. Nonetheless, from a recent survey of Title III coordinators in state education agencies, it has been possible to obtain a reasonably accurate picture of the trends in funding for this unusually significant program, and the results will be reviewed in some detail in the special

---

* See Note on Chart, page 119.

Title III study referred to earlier.

In general, however, it appears that the peak activity under ESEA's two major titles was reached in fiscal 1967 in so far as arts and humanities education is concerned. When the official figures for fiscal 1970 are in for both Title I and Title III of ESEA, I strongly suspect that they will reveal a sharp drop in support for such programs -- for reasons which will be discussed later in this report.

With this much by way of general background, it's time to take a closer look at some of the legislative programs themselves -- beginning with the major source of support for arts and humanities education, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and its separate but interwoven titles.

## The Elementary and Secondary Education Act

Several observers of the legislative process have pointed out that the architects of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act managed to design a legislative package which, as originally enacted, addressed itself to two major educational goals: one, the quality of education and, two, equality of educational opportunity.[1] (See page 137 for references.)

In this view, Title III (risk money for innovation) and Title IV (research and development), were seen as the major instruments for quickening the pursuit of educational excellence, and for achieving major long-range gains in educational quality. Titles I, II and V, on the other hand, were regarded as the principal weapons for attacking the widespread inequality of educational opportunity -- mainly by providing massive new services to poor children (Title I), but also by providing needed instructional materials and library resources (Title II), and by improving the capabilities of state education agencies (Title V).

Because of the broad general goals of this extraordinary piece of legislation, it has been possible for virtually every special educational interest group to benefit from it. In the three major titles aimed at providing direct financial assistance to school systems (Title I, II and III), no academic disciplines or instructional categories were ignored; in fact, for the first time in the history of federal aid to education, the language of this act contained specific references to the arts, the humanities, and to cultural activities and events as examples of the kind of "imaginative and creative" programs which could be supported.

Since -- albeit with differing emphases and purposes -- each title of the new act offered schoolmen a glittering new array of possible routes for obtaining financial assistance in achieving both quality and equality in their programs, it suddenly posed a whole new set of questions to them. It no longer said, as NDEA did for so many years: "if you want your teachers to receive additional summer training, we can give you the money to do it -- BUT -- you can only offer this to your science, math and foreign language teachers." Instead, it said, in effect: "There are many ways of improving education and we offer you some financial help for making improvements in your system -- BUT -- you must first decide what aspects of your program most urgently need attention, and then you must choose what you believe will be the most effective way or ways of tackling the problem."

In effect, ESEA put an end to the era of federal aid to education which dealt narrowly with apparent educational emergencies (i.e., NDEA as a response to Sputnik) on a kind of forced feeding take-this-medicine-or-none at-all basis. Instead, it presented applicants for federal aid with ways to enlist the help of expert diagnosticians and with a whole drugstore full of possible remedies -- in effect, leaving the choice of medicines up to them. Local options of this kind were not easy for schoolmen to handle at first; it forced them to make hard choices, and often to choose hastily. And (for better or for worse) it produced a new generation of educational proposal-writers who, in the initial years of the new act, went after everything in sight.

This approach was most applicable to Title III: virtually anything could be tried -- and indeed almost everything was; at least it was proposed if not always approved. Since (as I will cover in detail in the separate study) the Title III pot of money was limited, not everything could be approved anyway, and competition within each state was intense.

But the "you decide" approach was also applicable to all the other titles as well. The only major limitation on Title I funds was simply that they had to be used to meet the educational needs of children from low-income families. Within this broad restriction, the field was wide open. With Title II, the same thing was true. So long as applications for funds dealt with needed instructional materials and library resources, the subject matter areas were in no way proscribed.

A similar range of applicant options applied to Title IV; any educational issue could be addressed, so long as it was susceptible to investigation through research and development techniques. And, with respect to Title V, so long as funds were used to strengthen the state education agency, there was little restriction as to their ultimate use.

Thus, while ESEA could not technically be called a "general aid to education" bill, its categorical character was so liberally defined as to be almost non-existent. In addition, if applicants (whether they were school systems, state education agencies, new research institutions, or simply individuals) could not secure assistance for worthy projects within the broad categorical area of one title, it was often possible for them to do so from another.

It was essentially this feature which made ESEA into something of a gold-mine for the long-neglected field of arts and humanities education. Clearly, to greater or lesser degrees, each of the titles of this historic act could provide assistance for a wide range of programs and projects dealing with the arts and humanities, and with what have come to be termed "cultural enrichment activities." That they were indeed ultimately tapped for such purposes -- and in unprecedented amounts -- is a matter of record.

The question is: how much of this new educational money was actually spent on the arts and humanities (and particularly on the creative and performing arts) -- and what did it buy?

I propose in the next section, to examine each of the ESEA titles from this standpoint and see what kind of a scope-and-variety pattern emerges. Following this, other educational legislation will be reviewed, as well as legislation administered by other federal agencies, with the same general purpose in mind: to analyze the extent of federal funding in this field, and to examine the scope and variety of programs that were generated by it.

> /Before moving into this analysis of ESEA, however, I ought to remind the reader of my earlier comments regarding the limitations of this study with respect to the

so-called humanistic disciplines. Again, my primary concern is with the creative and performing arts, and with interdisciplinary activities which attempt to link the study and practice of the arts with other subject matter fields. The inclusion of activities termed "cultural enrichment" will give us some problems, particularly with respect to Title I - but, as will be seen, there is no way of getting at the available data at all if the term "cultural enrichment" is excluded as an instructional category. I will deal with this distinction directly, however, in the Title I discussion rather than confront it out of context here.]

## Title I

Paridoxically, although Title I of ESEA is in every sense the largest program under consideration, it is the one we seem to know the least about. In actuality, it is its very size -- in terms of dollars spent, school districts involved, and programs and projects generated -- that make it difficult to analyze in any detailed manner, on a national basis.

Since its inception in fiscal 1966, Title I has been pouring over a billion dollars a year into the nation's school systems in a major attempt to come to grips with the problem of inequality of educational opportunity. Its official purpose is "to encourage and support the establishment, expansion, and improvement of special programs (including the construction of minimum school facilities where needed) to meet the special needs of educationally deprived children of low-income families." Between 17,000 and 18,000 school districts (out of a total of about 22,000) have been eligible for funds; in the first four years of the program (fiscal 1966-69), these districts received a total of $4.3 billion of Title I funds, less a few million for state agency programs and administration.

No state or local matching funds are required. Local educational agencies (LEAs) in every county of each state are eligible for payments based on a complicated head-count formula: one-half the average per pupil expenditure in the state multiplied by the number of children from poor families. ("Poor," in the language of the Act, originally meant families having an annual income of $2000 -- but Congress later authorized $3000 as the low-income factor beginning with fiscal 1968).

Title I funds cannot be used for the general education programs of the schools -- and this issue, incidentally, has recently been the basis of criticism of the program on the part of civil rights groups; several studies by these groups have indicated that many state and local officials have used Title I funds as general aid (for poor and not-so-poor students alike) and that they have also used it to supplant rather than supplement state and local funds. Thus they have, in effect, reduced their state and local effort by the amount of new federal funds they received, rather than treating this money as extra assistance for schools with high concentrations of poor children. As a result of this criticism the Office of Education announced plans recently for much stricter program accountability in these matters

The basic administration of the Title I program is lodged with the states; once the allocation formula has been applied to a given state and each district knows the full amount of its entitlement, an official application is submitted by district officials to the state education agency. In this application, local school officials describe how they intend to use the funds. In major metropolitan systems, a whole range of separate projects may be established, each utilizing a different remedial or compensatory technique, serving a different educational level, or involving different subject matter fields. In smaller systems -- in isolated rural areas, for the most part -- perhaps only two or three projects may be initiated. Seldom does a district concentrate all its Title I money in a single, one-category project -- mainly because poor students are found at different educational levels throughout the system, and the educational needs and interventions vary accordingly.

Because of this -- plus the impossibility of recording in any meaningful way the countless variations in approach to this massive educational effort -- the reporting of Title I activities nationwide has never been on a project-by-project basis. This is quite different from the Title III situation, incidentally; with only about one-tenth of the funds available to it, less than 4000 projects were approved and in operation during its entire first four years. Title III is, therefore, quite susceptible to project-by-project analysis – either on a sampling or a total universe basis, depending on the survey funds available and how detailed a study one wants to make.

Title I projects, on the contrary, are reported by school systems and the states in terms of "Instructional Activities" and "Service Activities." Except for the first year (when the program got off to a late start and many local districts were forced to improvise rather freely to spend their money in 6 to 8 months) about 65 - 75 percent of the funds have been spent on instructional activities as opposed to service activities.

The list of thirteen individual instructional activities on the report form that first year ran from Speech Therapy, Home Economics and Foreign Languages to General Compensatory Education (whatever that is), a category called "Reading, English language arts, and English as a second language", and the category of direct interest to us: "Art, Music, and Cultural Enrichment". There are some intriguing breakdowns of the data on these last three categories which I'll get into in a moment.

First, however, to clarify what "Service Activities" refer to, the list includes such things as Food, Library, Health (including psychiatric), Transportation, Clothing, School Social Work, and so on. Clearly, although all of these services require little justification in terms of the needs of many poor children, it would seem that none of them -- with the possible exception of "Transportation" -- has any direct connection with the arts. (The statistical report does not state whether the costs of transportation, for a project in which disadvantaged students are transported to a theatre performance, a concert, or a museum, for example, are included in the "Transportation" line or the "Cultural Enrichment" category.)

Finally, two other points deserve mention here. First, the report form itself has been changed, and presumably refined, from year to year; some instructional activity categories have been added and others deleted or sub-divided. Of significance to this analysis of the arts in Title I, however, is the fact that the "Art, Music and Cultural Enrichment" category remained intact the first two years but, in the third year (fiscal 1968), it was sub-divided into three separate lines -- as was all the other pertinent data, such as participating children, grade levels involved, percentages, and so on. Second, the first year's report form combined the listings for summer school programs with those for the regular school programs; in the second and third years, data on summer programs was reported in separate tabulations.

Data on the fourth year, fiscal 1969, is now being processed and analyzed by the Office of Education and is expected to be available by mid-summer. The reporting form has been changed again -- perhaps for the better in the long run, as it is a first attempt at presenting consolidated program information on an annual basis for twelve legislative programs administered by the Office of Education. But it adds a new problem for anyone attempting to assess the extent of Title I arts activities since the new form includes dramatic arts in the "English Language Arts" category, and then, strangely enough, puts foreign languages in a category labeled simply "Cultural," along with the usual "art" and "music." It will be difficult to make any effective analysis of this new approach to Title I's statistical reports, I'm afraid, as far as the arts are concerned.

This rather lengthy explanation of the forms and procudures for reporting on Title I activities is necessary if one is to sense the full extent of the problem one faces in attempting to make sense of the available data. And, aside from a few isolated state reports[2] on "the arts and Title I", and an Office of Education publication identifying 150 representative Title I projects,[3] this is in truth the full extent of the "available data". There appears to be no way to determine the extent of arts projects and activities on a national basis other than to attempt to interpret these annual statistical reports as best one can.

The tables on the next several pages bring together most of the relevant data. The first,"Title I and the Arts," is a composite table indicating the authorizations, total appropriations, and expenditures for art, music, and cultural enrichment activities for the first three years of Title I. It will be immediately apparent that the three-year total of expenditures for "Art, Music, and Cultural Enrichment" (including summer school programs) was just under $200 million. The expenditures for regular school programs went from $57 million the first year (which got off to a late start, as was mentioned earlier) to $68 million the second year, and back down to about $41 million the third year. If summer school programs are added to this for 1967 and 1968, the totals run from $57 million the first year up to almost $84 million the second year, and drop down to about $56 million the third year.

It is hard to imagine this kind of money suddenly being lavished on an aspect of education which has habitually been peripheral to the day-to-day business of the schools -- and largely excluded from the values the schools have traditionally revered. Yet suddenly it happened: virtually no money one year for such pursuits; $57 million the next! $84 million the year after that.

## Title I and the Arts: Expenditures, 1966 - 68*

(in millions of dollars)

|  | Funding Totals |  | Expenditures by Instructional Category -- Regular and Summer Programs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Years | Total Amount Authorized | Total Amount Appropriated | Cult. Enrichment (incl. art & music | % of Total | Summer Program A-M-C | Art | % | Music | % | Cult. Enrichment | % | Annual Totals | Number of Projects | % |
| 1966 | 1,192.9 | 959.0 | 57.5 | 7.4 | NA | NA |  | NA |  | NA |  | 57.5 | 6,220 | 28% |
| 1967 | 1,430.0 | 1,053.0 | 68.0 | 7.7 | 15.8 | NA |  | NA |  | NA |  | 83.8 | NA | NA |
| 1968 | 1,902.1 | 1,191.0 | NA |  | (15.5)→ | 9.7<br>(3.9)<br>13.6 | 1.5<br>2.4 | 12.3<br>(3.1)<br>15.3 | 1.8<br>1.9 | 18.9<br>(8.5)<br>27.4 | 2.8<br>5.2 | 56.4 | NA | NA |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 3-Year Total: |  |  |  |  |  | 197.7 |  |  |

---

* NA = Not Available

The second table, on page 23, adds further to the sense of unreality. This table is a rank-order arrangement of the three instructional categories in which the most money was spent in each of the first three years of Title I operation. It shows that, strictly in terms of total expenditures, the only other instructional activity to receive more money than "Art, Music and Cultural Enrichment" was that concerned with the teaching of reading. Which is to say, the administrators and educators responsible for meeting the urgent educational needs of poor children appear to have believed -- in these first three years, at least -- that, next to developing their ability to read and use the English language effectively, the most significant contribution the schools could make to the social and educational health of these children was to nourish their aesthetic and cultural sensibilities in some way. (This is clearly what the figures indicate in the second and third years of the program; in the first, although expenditures for "General Compensatory Education" were second largest, they seem unrelated to any specific instructional area and do not therefore alter the point significantly.)

The surprising thing to me about this rather astonishing fact -- the relatively strong emphasis placed by Title I administrators on projects relating to the arts and to cultural affairs generally -- is that it appears not to have surprised anyone else in the educational establishment (or out of it). Hardly anyone, in fact, appears to have taken notice of it at all. Aside from a casual reference in the annual statistical reports, the Title I

## Title I: Top Three Instructional Categories, 1966-68*

## (expenditures in millions of dollars)

| FY 1966 | Regular Session | | Summer Programs | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Instructional Category | Amount Spent | Percent of Total | Amount Spent | Percent of Total |
| Reading, English language arts, and English as a second language | 246.1 | 31.6% | NA | NA |
| General Compensatory Education | 107.9 | 13.9% | NA | NA |
| Art, Music, and Cultural Enrichment | 57.5 | 7.4% | NA | NA |
| FY 1967 | | | | |
| English - Reading | 323.4 | 36.6% | 53.5 | NA |
| Art, Music, and Cultural Enrichment | 68.0 | 7.7% | 15.8 | NA |
| Mathematics | 40.7 | 4.6% | 14.4 | NA |
| FY 1968 | | | | |
| English - Reading | 240.7 | 36.1% | 51.5 | 31.4% |
| Art, Music, and Cultural Enrichment | 40.9 | 6.1% | 15.6 | 9.5% |
| Mathematics | 24.9 | 3.7% | 17.7 | 10.8% |

---

* NA = Not Available

program analysts and planners have not even remarked on it, let alone pondered what it may mean.

This indifference may be because, on a strict percentage basis, the expenditures for instructional activities in Art, Music and Cultural Enrichment are about what one would expect: less than 10 percent of the total, the high being 7.7 percent the second year; this is in rather general accord with traditional school spending for (or emphasis on) the arts. Nonetheless, to me it is highly significant that, with a spectrum of more than a dozen subject matter areas to choose from, so many hard-headed administrators in every section of the nation decided to spend enough of this new federal money on the softer, affective aspects of the curriculum to place them second in priority overall.

It may be that part of the answer to this can be found in a more detailed analysis of that large and all-inclusive category termed "cultural enrichment". How much of the money those first two years -- when the subject matter areas were not listed separately -- went for Art and Music, and how much went for Cultural Enrichment? And what kinds of projects were indeed included and conducted under the broad umbrella labeled "cultural enrichment"?

Precise answers to both of these questions may never be possible on a national basis. I suspect the only way to come even partially to grips with the problem is to subject the existing figures to some rough extrapolations. For example, in the third year (fiscal 1968), where separate categorical breakdowns for Art, for Music, and for Cultural Enrichment projects have been provided, Cultural Enrichment activities accounted for slightly less than half of the total expenditures; this holds up whether the figures relate to regular term activities (18.9 million for Cultural Enrichment out of a total of $40.9 million), or to regular and summer programs added together ($27.4 million out of $56.5 million). In summer programs alone, Cultural Enrichment accounted for over half the expenditures -- $8.5 million out of a total of $15.6 million.

If we assume that this ratio was roughly the same in the first two years of the program, Cultural Enrichment expenditures would have accounted for about $29 million in fiscal 1966 as opposed to $28.5 million for Art and Music together; in fiscal 1967, about $43 million might have gone into Cultural Enrichment and about $40.8 million into Art and Music.

One can only speculate -- and broadly, at that -- about the proportion of Cultural Enrichment projects and activities that were specifically related to the creative and performing arts. The issue is further complicated by the fact that we have no way of knowing whether projects which, for example, bussed students to symphony concerts or involved black students actively in the creation and performance of African music were regarded (and thus reported) by school officials as "music projects" or as "cultural enrichment activities"; such projects have been listed in both categories in some of the state and federal publications which bring together descriptions of representative projects.

A 1968 Office of Education publication entitled "Profiles in Quality Education" lists and describes "150 outstanding Title I projects from across the Nation [which have] been designated by Title I Coordinators as worth emulating." It includes eleven projects in a section labeled "Cultural Enrichment". The projects range in type from one which instituted two new Negro History classes in two high schools for 60 students in grades 10 through 12, to a summer project called "Cultural Enrichment Program for Delinquent Girls" (field trips to cultural sites and events for 170 girls); from a project involving 260 students in grades 4 through 6 in instrumental music instruction (3 classes a week) to a project in which a professional theatre company toured scenes from "relevant plays" to some 28,000 students in inner city junior high and high schools; from a project in which 1500 urban elementary school children are "offered experiences in sculpture, ceramics, weaving and wood carving" to a project in which six itinerant teachers provided professional instruction in music, library science, and physical education to 1400 rural children for 45 minutes every third day.

The melange of activities suggested by these representative examples is typical of the projects officials have listed in "Cultural Enrichment" categories all across the country. The bussing of students from poverty area schools to professional theatre, symphony or opera performances; field trips to history museums or science centers as well as to art museums and galleries; traveling artmobiles in rural counties; summer camping experiences; boat rides around Manhattan Island or Boston Harbor; the introduction of ethnic dance into elementary classrooms; participation in jazz or rock workshops by high school students; in-service teacher training in theatre games or improvisational drama -- all these, and literally thousands of variations of them, have been part of the Title I "cultural enrichment" experience.

If one were to discount as much as half the total expenditures now listed under the "Cultural Enrichment" category as being concerned with science, or history, or outdoor living, or other non-arts-related cultural activities, we are still left with a sizeable amount that could have been spent directly on the creative and performing arts. It amounts to about $50 million over the three-year period; and if then are added to this figure the estimated amounts already allocated to Art and Music in each of these years, the total expenditure for the arts comes to perhaps $148 million. (See table, page 28.)

And even if one assumes that this $148 million was indeed all spent on the creative or performing arts in some manner or other, there remains a need to look more closely at what that manner might have been. There is reason to believe -- but no hard data to support the belief at this time -- that a great many projects in the music and cultural enrichment categories tended to emphasize the occasional exposure of youngsters to so-called cultural events, in an attempt to compensate for the presumed deprivation of their own cultural life and family background. An example of such a project is one in the city of Dallas in which some three thousand inner city

### The Arts and Title I:

### Revised Expenditure Estimates, 1966 - 68*
(in millions of dollars)

| | Art | Music | Cultural Enrichment<br>Mainly Arts | <br>Mainly "Culture" | Totals |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1966 | 13.4 | 15.1 | 14.5 | 14.5 | 57.5 |
| 1967 | 19.0 | 21.8 | 21.5 | 21.5 | 83.8 |
| 1968 | 13.6 | 15.3 | 13.7 | 13.7 | 56.3 |
| | 46.0 | 52.2 | 49.7 | 49.7 | 197.6 |
| Creative and performing arts: | | 147.9 | | | |

---

* Based on ratios for 1968 - and assuming half of Cult. Enr. figures are not related to the arts per se.

black children in the 5th through 8th grades were bussed to the city auditorium for a lush $20,000 performance of Offenbach's "Orpheus in the Underworld". I saw this performance and was given to understand that it was repeated for another three thousand students later in the week. I have no way of knowing what, if anything, these 6000 black children felt about this one-shot exposure to white Western culture but it did occur to me to wonder whether that $40,000 might not have been spent more effectively in some other manner. It seemed not to have occurred to the Title I officials in the city of Dallas, however. This is clearly an extreme example, and I have been informed that other cities have conducted similar projects at a much more reasonable cost and in a far less chauvanistic manner. But I am not so sure that even they have really subjected the stated rationale for such projects to rigorous scrutiny.

It is difficult to say, given the paucity of the data available, whether this kind of cultural missionryism was widely conducted to the neglect of programs which focused on direct involvement by the child in arts or arts-related experiences. There are numerous examples of Title I projects in the arts which do seem to have genuine merit, at least on an experimental or pilot basis. But there seems to be no way to find out precisely how widespread the incidence of these projects has been nationally, the kind and extent of their impact on poverty-area students, or whether it is likely that local school officials would decide to continue them without federal support.

Increasingly, however, the evaluations of Title I conducted by local officials have begun to indicate that programs which have emphasized random and loosely organized exposure to an arts event or activity seem to be regarded by those officials as being of questionable value. There is little they can point to in terms of student improvement in academic skills or cognitive gains in general subject matter fields from these general cultural exposure programs -- nor, for that matter, from the projects concerned with direct student involvement in the processes of the arts. Without, therefore, being able to distinguish too clearly between what they feel (but can't prove) are effective arts or cultural enrichment projects and those they believe are not only economically wasteful but educationally unsound, these local administrators appear to be curtailing drastically the entire cultural enrichment effort in Title I programming all across the country. My feeling about this is based on isolated reports and conversations, and there is no way to substantiate it until the fourth year statistical report, for fiscal 1969, is available.* It is my very strong hunch, however, that this fourth year report will reveal a considerable drop in spending for projects in the general "Cultural" category, if not for "Art" and "Music" as well.

In a good many instances, this will consist of excising those elements of the Title I "cultural enrichment" philosophy that should never have been implemented in the first place -- so it is entirely proper, in my view, that these cut-backs should occur. The problem with this kind of wholesale

---

* Again -- see Note on page 119.

surgery, however, is that a good many worthwhile projects in the arts may be cut down in the process, or stopped at the planning stage without ever being initiated at all. Because of the non-selective method of reporting Title I projects in arbitrary instructional categories, the tendency will be strong for administrators and teachers to equate viable and imaginative projects in the arts with the term "cultural enrichment." The result may well be that a whole generation of otherwise sympathetic school administrators (who have already spent over $200 million on "The Arts" without much urging, or any real sense of purpose) will revert to their traditional roles and continue neglecting the aesthetic needs and sensibilities of children; and they will do it under the erronious notion that the Title I experience proved that efforts to meet such needs through activities in "the cultural arts" simply haven't worked!

The Title I experience may, indeed, have proved that cultural chauvanism is not only wasteful of public funds but is a direct affront to the dignity of the poor and the culturally different. It has not proved, so far, that the affective needs and aesthetic sensibilities of children -- poor and non-poor alike -- cannot be nurtured successfully by well-designed arts experiences, because such an approach has not really been tried very widely, so far as I can determine, during Title I's first several years. Nor, to my knowledge, has there been any major effort to determine whether the problems poor children have in learning to read and write might not be more readily overcome if these children were involved directly in some of the creative processes of the arts.

These remain as the most intriguing ways in which Title I programs in the arts might address themselves to the urgent problems of social and educational survival among the largely non-white children of poverty-area schools. For a program which is placing such overwhelming emphasis on teaching the children of the poor to read . . . . for such a program to ignore so consistently the potential for motivation, self-actualization, and non-verbal expression which exists in the arts is more than a little puzzling. Particularly, now that it is clear that the methods we've been using to teach these children to read and write have largely failed; now, when the Commissioner of Education has launched a new "Right to Read Program," it seems to me that it's time to put some of this massive Title I money into research and development activities that might produce some better ways to teach these fundamental skills.

And finally, rather than spending so much time and money on exposing culturally-different children to the cultural values of the dominant society, it seems to me Title I might consider developing more programs which utilize the arts to illuminate the children's own cultural past. Some projects have indeed done just this -- but far too few, in my judgment.

## Title II

Essentially, this title of ESEA provides grants to the states to help local school systems acquire school library resources of all kinds, and to purchase textbooks and other printed and published instructional materials. The authorized resources and materials include -- in addition to texts and library books -- such things as periodicals, documents, magnetic tapes, charts, globes, phonograph records, films and other audio-visual devices -- in fact virtually anything of this sort which is normally used by students and teachers at all educational levels (and in private as well as public schools).

During the first four years, Congress authorized amounts which increased from $100 million in 1966 to $167 million in 1969. Appropriations, as might be expected, hovered generally around the $100 million mark for all four years.

Without question, some of these funds have been utilized by school systems to purchase instructional and library materials for use in creative and performing arts programs. How extensive this practice has been is impossible to determine, short of conducting a state-by-state, system-by-system survey. Even if this were done, however, it is hard to see what significance could be given it, since -- once again -- applications for purchases under Title II were developed and submitted by local school officials in light of their own perceived needs. Reported acquisitions related to the arts, were such information available, might reflect a need to "catch up" in one instructional field, a response to normal student population growth in another, or simply a need to stock a new library or to provision other newly-built facilities.

If it can be assumed that materials and resource purchases related to the arts followed the customary spending patterns found in other ESEA programs, perhaps 10% of the annual Title II appropriation might have been spent on arts-related items nationwide. $10 million a year, perhaps -- about 1/15th of the current annual operating budget for the public school system of Montgomery County, Maryland.

There appears to be good reason to assume, further, that this kind of expenditure will continue as long as ESEA's Title II receives roughly the same level of annual appropriations. It will provide schools with funds to do more than they would normally be able to do, under state and local support programs -- and to spend about the same proportion of this extra federal money on arts-related materials as they customarily spend out of annual operating budgets. It certainly provides a welcome floor for expenditures related to some of the necessary "things of education", in the area of the arts as in other program areas.

Furthermore, there is a good chance that the lion's share of the Title II money which did not buy items related specifically to the arts was, instead, spent on materials falling directly within the broad purview of the Humanities Curriculum. For many years, the several titles of NDEA assisted schools with the purchase of materials and equipment to upgrade their capabilities in the areas of mathematics and the sciences; it seems likely, therefore, that a majority of this new ESEA Title II money went for the purchase of textbooks, maps, documents, recordings, tapes, films and other audio-visual aids (plus simply adding "books" to school libraries) which supplemented and augmented instruction in the fields of literature, history, geography, languages, sociology and other humanistic disciplines.

If this is so -- and it certainly seems probable -- then the arts and humanities as a whole might be said to have been immeasurably enriched under this piece of federal legislation. It's easy, of course, to drop $100 million a year down an "instructional-materials-hole," particularly in a national program of this nature in which the benefits presumably are available to every school system in the country where officials hear about the windfall and submit an application. But, on balance, the chances are this has been (and will continue to be) money well spent, if only because it has relieved some of the pressure on local funds which schools are increasingly hard put to allocate realistically these days. Anyone who has attended a school board meeting at budget discussion time and listened to the paring-down process knows how difficult it has become to acquire some of the necessary "things" of education, particularly in large urban systems. With about 80% of school operating costs now going to purchase human services, and with more and more of these cost increases automatically mandated in salary schedules, the only area responsive to economies often seems to be that relating to "things" -- perhaps because they're inanimate and don't scream, strike, or demonstrate when you cut them back.

It is worth mentioning here that in some states, a portion of the annual Title II allocation seems to have been set aside for special purpose grants. Usually, this amount ranged from 10 to 15% of the total, and it was used to develop special collections around certain subject matters and to support special curriculum emphases. Some of these were activities in the arts and humanities fields, such as:

* A cultural resource center has been developed in Jackson, Ohio, to serve some 1100 children in grades 1 - 8 in five rural elementary schools; the multi-media collection of art, music and poetry materials was designed to "enhance the cultural development of rural children in the early grades."
* In Gates County, North Carolina, the funds were used to acquire a collection of printed and audiovisual materials which, collectively, form "an in-depth art reference collection for children and teachers to use to relate the visual arts to the total curriculum."

In New York City's District 6, a media center serving 38,000 students (grades K - 8 in 45 schools) provided multi-media resources on the contribution of Negroes and Puerto Ricans in the history and development of New York.

- In Clark County (Las Vegas), Nevada, pupils in four elementary schools are using new printed and audio-visual materials in programs designed to give them "an appreciation of the contributions made to American life and culture by minority groups."

This pattern seems to have been followed by about 30 states, and it is likely that instances similar to those mentioned above could be found in abundance by sifting through the applications or project descriptions state by state.

So much, then, for ESEA's Title II: fiscally not very significant, but likely to have resulted in a bigger library-resources-and-instructional-materials bonanza for the arts and humanities in the nation's schools than is generally realized. More money would certainly help -- and full funding up to the original authorization would be especially welcome. But even as it now exists, Title II performs an extremely important role in underwriting some necessary educational costs -- and while the arts may have shared in the benefits in their customarily modest fashion, the humanities generally appear to have benefited handsomely indeed.

## Title III

The aspects of Title III which are relevant to these studies will, as has been mentioned several times, be dealt with in a separate report. For the moment -- simply in terms of global statistics -- let me say only that this title seems to have supported something on the order of 400 projects dealing in some way with the creative and performing arts during the initial five years of ESEA's existence. It is easily the most intriguing title, vis a vis the arts, of any federal program under consideration. Expenditures ran to an average of about 18.2 million a year the first four years (with the likelihood that they will drop to a fraction of that amount when the current fifth-year figures are in).

A survey of project funding extending into the current fiscal year has been accomplished in connection with this study and should enable us to develop a much more up-to-date picture of the scope and variety of Title III programming than will ever be possible with Title I.

## Title IV (The Arts and Humanities Program)

Title IV of ESEA is the educational research and development title. Basically, Title IV is an amendment to the Cooperative Research Act of 1954 which originally authorized governmental arrangements with colleges, universities, and other public or private agencies "for the conduct of research, surveys, and demonstrations in the field of education." By fiscal 1965, eleven years later, appropriations under this act have risen only to about $16 million. When added to special categorical funds administered by the Office of Education from other legislation (for research related to foreign languages, media, vocational education, etc.), the total investment in educational research in fiscal 1965 came to about $36 million.

Abruptly, in fiscal 1966, this investment rose to $81.3 million, some $35 million of which resulted directly from passage of ESEA and the increased commitment to educational research reflected in the provisions of Title IV. By 1968, the total research allocation had risen to nearly $100 million and it has remained at about this level in the two years following. Of this, an average of slightly under $2 million a year, during this five-year period, has been spent on research and development activities relating to arts and humanities education.

Up to the summer of 1965, just prior to ESEA's passage, the concerns of the arts and humanities in the field of education had been formally recognized for only a little more than three years by the United States Office of Education, following establishment in 1962 of a unit called the Cultural Affairs Branch.

Support for the branch's project activities that first year came to the munificent sum of $28,769! By fiscal 1965 allocations had risen to about $723,000, and the activities -- not exclusively research-oriented, as yet -- spanned most of the subject matter areas embraced by the creative and performing arts. Some scholarly studies in the humanities were also being supported.

In the summer of 1965, however, the Office of Education was reorganized along bureau lines relating to educational levels, plus an "all-level" bureau of research, and the existing activities concerned with arts and humanities education became part of a new unit officially known as the Arts and Humanities Program. Administratively, because its work was not confined to a single educational level, the new program was lodged in the Bureau of Research -- which, in turn, was very shortly given the primary administrative responsibility for conducting the expanded educational research program authorized by ESEA's Title IV. And, for the first time, federal education funds under this Title were specifically allocated for the support of "research and related activities in the arts and humanities."

The money itself was relatively insignificant from a fiscal standpoint (never more than $2.4 million, its 1966 allocation). But the Arts and

Humanities Program was becoming a highly important programmatic enclave within the Office of Education by this time, exerting an influence on educational development in the arts and humanities far beyond the several million research dollars it administered.

There appear to be several cogent reasons for this. First, of course, there was all that new legislation; in addition to ESEA, with its hearty programmatic embrace of the arts in Titles I and III, there was Public Law 89-209 which established the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities with its twin endowments, which were just becoming operational as well. There were also the programs of the Office of Economic Opportunity which, in the beginning at least, were used to support certain kinds of "community action" projects in the arts.

All of the legislative activity seemed to conjoin at about this time to focus national attention on the new policies and programs being developed at the federal level which held high promise for the arts and humanities. The Office of Education received major attention in all this -- simply because it controlled much more of the potential money for the arts than the two Endowments -- and the Arts and Humanities Program soon was serving both as the spokesman for these concerns within U.S.O.E. and as an informal clearing house for cultural information to a growing national constituency.

Furthermore, as interest in these programs heightened, it became clear that a variety of new complementary relationships had to be established among the individuals, agencies and constituencies affected by this new legislation. It seemed advisable, therefore, to create within the Office of Education a position which could represent the Commissioner of Education in arts planning, and in organizational and program matters of an inter-agency nature as well as within the Office of Education itself. This concern resulted in the appointment of the Director of the Arts and Humanities Program (Miss Kathryn Bloom) as Special Advisor to the Commissioner on the Arts and Humanities. Significantly, this also took place during the summer of 1965, and moved the Program, and its staff into a strategic position to influence developments in this field both within and beyond U.S.O.E.

A third factor was the staff itself which, by late 1965, had been expanded -- and which I myself joined in the spring of 1966, as a kind of generalist concerned principally with a unique educational theatre experiment and with the arts in relation to the education of disadvantaged children. (My further observations about Title IV and the Arts and Humanities Program, then, will necessarily be grounded in personal experience, and their value, therefore, may lie more in their firsthand subjective insights -- recognized as such -- than in any attempt at dispassionate objectivity.)

At its peak period, the AHP staff had an education specialist for most of the major arts education fields: music education, theater and dance education, art education, museum education and the humanities -- in addition to a sort of special projects person (myself). In essence, all the disciplines were covered: most of the major associations of arts educators (MENC, AETA, NAEA, AAM, SAA, etc.) gradually began to realize they had friends in court, so to speak, already representing their interests, and concerned with their problems. As the word spread about this, additional claims were made on the time of the AHP staff people: they were asked to take on a great number of speaking engagements, serve on all kinds of national and regional task forces, and attend countless conferences, seminars, and planning groups, representing the Office of Education, the Bureau of Research or simply the Arts and Humanities Program. In this way, slowly at first, but with increasing momentum, a whole new constitutency began to emerge and coalesce -- or perhaps it was a series of separate constituencies -- which had never before been represented at the federal level.

As a result, however, the time of the AHP staff was increasingly taken up with advising and counseling people who were coming to Washington to find out about all that new federal money for the arts everybody was talking about, and how they could get ahold of some of it. Some of these people were arts educators or researchers, whose claim on AHP staff time was entirely legitimate; others were from the arts professions and frequently seemed to have confused ESEA "money for the arts" with the funds available through the National Endowment for the Arts ("what *is* that, anyway -- a private foundation or what?") So -- perhaps because of the program name, perhaps because the information desk directed them to it -- those making the rounds of government agencies invariably turned up at the offices of the Arts and Humanities Program, often with the dazed look that comes to people seeking specific room numbers along endless government corridors that look incredibly alike. (Artists were naturally more affected by this than the impersonally anonymous educators -- and when they walked in and found friendly faces and people who respected the arts, their response was similar in many ways to Rabbit greeting Tigger after being lost all night in the mist at the top of Pooh's Forest.)

Most of them were understandably quite disappointed to learn that ESEA's purpose was not primarily to subsidize the arts and that they would actually have to perform some kind of educational service in order to qualify for Title III or Title I funds -- and that, indeed, the relatively meagre funds available to AHP were primarily for "educational research" in the arts. So, in effect, the AHP staffers became brokers of a sort during much of this period, 1965-67 -- trying to help all these concerned citizens distinguish between the various funding programs in the arts, counseling them about different proposal procedures, and sending them on to the proper source when it became evident that "educational research in the arts" was not what they were really interested in.

Beyond this, the AHP served in a somewhat different capacity within the federal bureaucracy generally and the Office of Education in particular. Here its members often functioned as a kind of guerilla unit, moving deliberately through and across administrative divisions, taking advantage of every genuine opportunity to improve the climate for, and the understanding of, these aesthetic and humanistic concerns among their generally indifferent agency colleagues. In this, to be sure, they had the full support of two successive Commissioners (both Keppel and Howe), as reflected by and implemented through the AHP Director's other assignment as Special Advisor on the Arts and Humanities. Relations between divisions were not always smooth and some bureaucratic feathers were ruffled in the process -- but the climate did ultimately improve.

So -- in summary on this point -- the Arts and Humanities Program was the early visible symbol of a new awareness on the part of the federal education agency that the arts and humanities were an important, though long-neglected, aspect of education, and its staff was visible evidence that the emerging needs in this area were at long last being given direct attention.

A fourth reason for the emergence of the Arts and Humanities Program into a position of considerable influence in the Office of Education was really the result of a well-conceived and soundly-executed plan in what might aptly be described as "audience development." In effect, it was aimed at developing a series of "state-of-the-art" reviews of particular fields of arts and humanities education *and*, in the process, energizing new segments of an increasingly concerned, well-informed, but generally leaderless constituency.

The device has been referred to by the former AHP Director as "the planned use of invited developmental activities;" its most effective vehicle was the so-called "Developmental Conference." The purpose was mainly stimulatory in nature. The procedure was to invite research-oriented projects (since, indeed, the Program used research funds) which utilized the expertise of a group of knowledgeable authorities to focus attention on some of the crucial problems in arts and humanities education. These developmental activities usually resulted in statements and recommendations regarding the status of the fields involved, and of the steps (including research and development work) which might be taken to help resolve them. The presumption was that, broadly disseminated, these statements and recommendations would receive national attention at most educational levels, and that their impact would be felt both within the educational enterprise itself and in informal educational programs operating outside the school environment.

As nearly as I can tell, beginning in 1963 with the Yale Seminar on Music Education, at least 27 planning conferences and status studies falling within this broad "developmental" category have received Arts and Humanities Program support to date; the cost has been only a little over a million dollars. The largest number have been in music education (6) and art education (9), perhaps because these fields have been accepted longer as subject matter areas by the schools and because more experienced educational researchers were therefore trained and available. Other developmental activities were undertaken in theater, crafts, classical studies, film study, museum education, dance and speech education. In addition, a special interdisciplinary conference in 1966 examined "The Role of the Arts in Meeting the Social and Education Needs of the Disadvantaged."

Among the more intriguing results of these activities is that they have apparently served to stimulate a large number of subsequent proposals in most of the same fields; the record is held by the Yale Music Seminar which is responsible for generating an estimated 25 new proposals in the music education field (not all of which were ultimately approved and funded, of course). Harlan Hoffa, formerly the art education specialist on the AHP staff and now a professor of art education at Pennsylvania State University, is presently engaged in a detailed analysis of all AHP developmental activities. His study is aimed principally at trying to determine what their impact has been -- what resulted from them, and how effective they have been in producing educational change. It should be an interesting study, well worth waiting for.

For a variety of reasons, then -- its establishment at a time of general euphoria over the new legislation, the full backing of two successive commissioners of education, the variety of intra-agency, inter-agency and public affairs tasks performed by its staff, and the planned use of a developmental activities program -- the Arts and Humanities Program seems to have had a considerable influence in the development of a new national educational climate for the arts and humanities in the late 1960's. In all of this, the desirability of involving the leadership from the various fields of the arts and humanities at policy and decision-making levels was fully recognized and -- as in the developmental activities -- systematically acted upon. The result was that a newly engaged and informed constituency in arts education indeed did appear to emerge after several years; its component parts were in no small measure mobilized by the kinds of strategies for obtaining direct individual and group involvement which were planned and carried out by the AHP staff.

In its more formal administrative tasks, the Program moved steadily ahead with project-oriented educational research and related activities. Its general objectives have embraced all of the following activities at one time or another:

* Basic research into the nature of perceptual learning;
* Curriculum development and improvement;
    a) training the talented in the arts
    b) the arts in the general education program
* Cooperation with state education agencies;
* Teacher preparation and re-training;
* The arts and their relationship to the disadvantaged;
* Training for administrative occupations in the arts;
* Training educational researchers in the arts and humanities;

- * International activities in arts education;
- * Joint projects with other federal agencies;
- * Dissemination: the need for ERIC Clearinghouse Centers in the Arts.

Depending on available funds, and on changes in priorities among these broad objectives, the actual support (both in numbers of projects and in money) provided to any one of these areas tended to vary from year to year. Over the years, probably the largest number of funded projects was in the curriculum development and improvement area; the second largest number of projects appear to have been concerned with basic and applied research -- not necessarily restricted to perceptual learning problems alone, but directed to a whole range of "new knowledge" categories related to teaching and learning in the arts. All of the art forms represented in the program -- art, music, dance, theater and film for the most part -- received major attention in terms of curriculum development and research activities. Projects in the humanities -- despite their inclusion in the Program's title -- received relatively less attention than the creative and performing arts, on the theory that the arts historically had been more severely neglected in education and that other sources of support for the humanistic disciplines were beginning to emerge, such as the National Endowment for the Humanities. Nonetheless, the latest listing of educational research projects supported by the Arts and Humanities Program, dated November, 1969, includes 16 projects in the general field of the humanities, of which two major studies (a dictionary of American regional English, and a clear text edition of the complete works of Melville) received by far the largest dollar amounts.

With respect to the visual and performing arts, projects in music education (64) were the most extensive mainly because this field got off to a head start with the Yale Music Seminar in 1963 (which in turn was due to the fact that a music education specialist, Harold Arberg, had been the first OE arts specialist appointment, in 1962). Art education projects were next in number (there had been 49 of them by fiscal 1970), followed by projects in theater education (21, including four related specifically to the Laboratory Theatre Program) and then by interdisciplinary or related arts projects listed under the heading of "Aesthetic Education" (12). Dance education was the last field to be developed -- with only five projects listed.

The disciplines of Architecture and Speech (which might just as well have been listed under Humanities) were favored with only one project each. Projects in fields listed as Media and Film Studies (funded under Table VII of NDEA), in Museum Education, and in Arts for the Disadvantaged numbered eight each. It is interesting to note, with regard to the latter category, that one of the earliest contemporary attempts to examine what role the arts might play in meeting the educational and social needs of disadvantaged children took place in the fall of 1966 in a developmental conference sponsored by AHP.

The GPO publication, "The Arts and the Poor: New Challenge for Educators," a narrative summary of this conference, was widely circulated (12,000 copies were sent to arts educators, researchers, administrators, artists, poverty workers, urbanologists and the like throughout the country) in a major effort to reach the leadership in all the relevant fields with these challenging concepts and possibilities.

Other than status studies, projects concerned with teacher preparation and re-training were never very actively pursued, first because it seemed to be difficult for researchers to shape coherent projects around such activities and, second, because by 1967 the Education Professions Development Act (EPDA) was in the legislative hopper and was shortly able to take over broad programmatic support of such activities. Before that, of course, some summer teacher training institutes in the arts and humanities field were being supported under Section 13 of the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act (NFAHA). This issue of teacher education -- an important one, to my way of thinking -- will be discussed more fully in a later section, that dealing with all those anagramatic programs: NDEA, NFAHA and EDPA.

In the program area concerned broadly with "the arts in general education," the most striking and potentially far-reaching development has been the Educational Laboratory Theatre Program. At an overall cost of about $6,400,000 during a four-year period that will end this September, this rather massive experimental program is probably the single largest federally-funded arts-in-education project in the nation's history. It seems to be enraptured with the number "three" -- three funding sources to support three-year programs in three major U.S. cities. Support came from three federal sources: the National Endowment for the Arts, and two titles of ESEA -- Title III, administratively lodged in U.S.O.E.'s Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education, and Title IV, administered by the Arts and Humanities Program in the Bureau of Research. Conceived as a cooperative, inter-agency venture from the beginning, it was envisioned as a three-year pilot project involving all the high school students in three major metropolitan areas in regular encounters with live theater. New resident companies of high professional quality were to be established in each city; new working relationships between the public schools (and interested private or parochial schools as well) and the resident companies would be experimentally developed to see if -- and how -- the living arts of the theater might become a significant educational experience and ultimately be made an integral part of the high school curriculum.

The three locations ultimately selected for the program were the entire state of Rhode Island, the New Orleans metropolitan area, and the city of Los Angeles. New theater companies were established in the latter two cities, while an existing company in Providence -- the Trinity Square Repertory Company -- became the production resource for high schools throughout Rhode Island. The three-year period of federal support for the Rhode Island and New

Orleans projects ended in June of last year, while the Los Angeles project will conclude at the end of current academic year.

Under a continuing arrangement, the Central Midwestern Regional Educational Laboratory (CEMREL), in St. Louis, Missouri, has been monitoring the entire four-year program from a research and assessment standpoint. The Laboratory has conducted a series of exploratory studies (some common to all three sites, others confined to a single project) into such things as curriculum needs, teacher preparation problems, and student impact and response; in addition, it has made a continuing analysis of the theater-school-community relationships in all three cities. The full CEMREL report is due to be completed this coming fall.

It seems probable that this study has probed more deeply into the many issues encompassed by such a performance program than anything yet undertaken -- and the final report is eagerly awaited therefore. It could contain extremely significant implications for all the relevant parties to such an enterprise: school administrators, teachers of English and drama, professional theater people, and community arts planners and supporters.

As one who has been associated with this project almost from the start, I am not really anticipating anything like a "favorable" assessment of the three projects themselves. It is no secret that all three were plagued with enormous scheduling difficulties, made all kinds of mistakes, had a continuing series of personnel upheavals, and seemed generally to operate from one crisis to another. I believe, however, that we can learn something from this program; I hope (and assume), therefore, that the report will spell out in detail what the essential elements should be if such programs are to work effectively anywhere -- providing they make any economic sense at all, on any terms. (Someone has said: "Experience is a valuable thing! It enables us to recognize our mistakes when we make them again." I trust such a cynical rationale will not prove out for similar projects after the CEMREL report is published and distributed).

The CEMREL organization, interestingly enough, is also working on another long-term project supported by the Arts and Humanities Program -- a five-year curriculum development activity called "The Aesthetic Education Program." In essence, the Laboratory is attempting to plan, design, field-test, refine, re-test, and finally produce for national distribution a series of flexible and imaginative curriculum units that will ultimately result in a comprehensive K-12 curriculum in aesthetic education. It is an enormously complex assignment, and CEMREL is only into its second year of the five-year operational phase, following an 18-months' planning phase.

The CEMREL operation represents a relatively new breed of educational research institution, and is one of 20 private, non-profit laboratories established since 1965 by the Office of Education under Title IV authority. These regional educational laboratories (now reduced to 15 because of funding cutbacks in fiscal 1969) were intended to speed up the pace at which the results of promising educational research are applied and used; their objectives are to "create and demonstrate a rich array of tested alternatives to existing educational practice, with choice of adoption resting in the hands of local school systems," according to a recent Bureau of Research report.

One of the five laboratories which U.S.O.E. closed out last year was one in Washington, D.C., which -- among other projects -- had undertaken to develop an arts and humanities curriculum for grades K-3. In actuality, it focused mainly on the arts of dance, theater, art, music and literature with respect to learning in early childhood. The closing of the lab left much of this work in limbo, inconclusively resolved, but with a good deal of promising spade-work accomplished -- and available to others who continue to plow this field.

Thus it is interesting to note that, of the 20 laboratories originally set up four years ago, only the Washington lab (CAREL) and CEMREL had any genuine interest in coming to grips with the problems of the arts in general education. One is now gone; only CEMREL remains -- and its arts projects are only a part of its total program. Nevertheless, with the Laboratory Theatre study due shortly and work on the aesthetic education curriculum program beginning to accelerate as the third year approaches, it seems to me that CEMREL (if it wants to) is in a position to assume major national leadership in the field of arts and humanities education in the near future. Whether it would wish to become something on the order of a "national center for aesthetic education" or not, I have no way of knowing. I do know that it has amassed some extremely strong credentials for doing imaginative work in this field by now, and that -- under Wade Robinson's leadership -- it has been soundly managed and efficiently run from the beginning. To me, therefore, it is intriguing to contemplate its potential as a kind of central instrumentality for coordinating the work going on throughout the country concerned with change and reform in this educational field.

* * *

During the six years the Arts and Humanities Program has been in existence, it has supported over 200 projects "designed to provide new knowledge and materials to strengthen education" in a variety of artistic and humanistic fields. It will have spent about $10.6 million on all these activities by next June 30th, the end of fiscal 1970. During the previous six-year period, 1959-64, incidentally, the program's earlier counterparts spent a total of not quite $600,000 (which seems an appropriate reflection of the degree of interest both the American people and their federal education agency had in humanistic values in the years following Sputnik and up to the advent of ESEA in 1965.)

The table on page 57 shows the relative emphasis, in terms of project funding, given to each of the eleven program categories for the six-year period, 1965-1970. As one would expect, by far the most money was spent

ARTS & HUMANITIES PROGRAM EXPENDITURES, 1965-1970

| | FY 1965 | FY 1966 | FY 1967 | FY 1968 | FY 1969 | FY 1970* | TOTALS |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Aesthetic Education | $ 38,457 | $ 50,870 | $ 28,336 | $138,785 | $169,356 | $114,518 | 540,322 |
| Architecture | -- | -- | 9,810 | -- | -- | -- | 9,810 |
| Art Education | 129,685 | 439,589 | 145,172 | 25,993 | 84,415 | 31,384 | 856,238 |
| Arts/Disadvantaged | -- | 81,222 | 46,229 | 100,671 | 36,076 | -- | 264,198 |
| Dance Education | 9,000 | 128,693 | 109,978 | 26,004 | -- | 50,604 | 324,279 |
| Humanities | 102,364 | 306,909 | 196,443 | 283,468 | 109,140 | 201,057 | 1,199,381 |
| Media | 144,290 | -- | 123,017 | 443,266 | 6,000 | 124,866 | 841,439 |
| Museum Education | 25,926 | 280,879 | -- | 27,860 | -- | -- | 334,665 |
| Music Education | 268,342 | 961,268 | 661,597 | 335,645 | 610,330 | 207,509 | 3,044,691 |
| Theatre Education | 5,432 | 152,811 | 537,765 | 681,026 | 785,626 | 422,010 | 2,584,670 |
| Speech Education | -- | -- | 53,694 | 4,628 | -- | -- | 58,322 |
| Total | $723,496 | $2,402,241 | $1,912,041 | $2,067,346 | $1,800,943 | $1,151,948 | $10,058,015 |

* Some Fiscal 1970 expenditures are still pending.

on music education. Next is theatre education, although if the amounts for the Educational Laboratory Theatre Program are excluded, the funding for theatre would fall to around $450,000 . This would make humanities projects the second largest funding category, followed by the visual arts, both of which have received in the neighborhood of a million dollars each. The steady increase in the "Aesthetic Education" category reflects, to a large extent, the development of the curriculum program at CEMREL beginning in fiscal 1968.

A separate aspect of Research Bureau support for the arts and humanities does not appear in the AHP budget breakdwon. This concerns what is termed the Regional Research Program -- in which small research projects, limited to $10,000 and granted for periods of not more than 18 months, are administered through the regional offices of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. During most of the years covered by this study, there were nine regional offices, each with a small educational research unit and a modest amount of money to administer.

Depending on the interest of the regional staff members, and on what they established as priorities for educational research in their own regions, projects in the arts and humanities received greater or less attention. In Region V (the Chicago area) during this period, for example, 11 projects were funded ranging from "A Demonstration and Research Program for Teaching Young String Players" to a study entitled "Artistic Preferences, Conceptual Thinking and Intellectual Attitudes."

Assuming that Chicago is representative of the other regions, this would mean that something like one hundred projects of this nature might have been supported over this period -- and at an average of perhaps $8,000 each, this would amount to about $800,000 which might have been used for arts and humanities education independently of the funds allocated to the Washington-based AHP Program staff. (Probably Chicago is not typical of other regions, so the number of projects and the total expenditures are apt to be much lower than this, in actuality.)

This brings up another issue relative to both the Arts and Humanities Program at U.S.O.E. and the Regional Research Program's efforts in this general field: namely, that although a large number of these projects were aimed ultimately at improving the quality of arts and humanities education at the public school level, the money itself was often used to support the university-based personnel who were engaged in these projects and related research activities. Thus, while the table indicating relative expenditures by art-form over this six-year period does not represent funds committed exclusively to pre-college educational levels, a large proportion of the $10.6 million total (plus the funds from Regional Research) was undoubtedly utilized to serve these ends in the long run.

Finally, it will immediately become apparent from this table that a rather disquieting trend downward in total AHP allocations (which directly affects spending, of course) seems to have set in, beginning in 1969. Much of this has been the result of a general hard-line approach to budget increases throughout government since the last year of the Johnson Administration. There are other reasons, of course, and they have to do with staff reductions in the program recently, with the lengthy and uncertain transition process between the Howe regime and the Allen regime at U.S.O.E., and with (I believe) the emergence of the two Endowments to positions of relative strength in the last few years.

The latter point will be developed more thoroughly later in this report, in the section dealing with the Endowments. Suffice to say here, however, that the problems and prospects relating to education seem to have become increasingly intriguing to the staffs of both Endowments these last few years -- so much so, in fact, that pressure has been put on the Bureau of the Budget to mandate line-item transfers of funds from U.S.O.E.'s Bureau of Research to the National Foundation, where the amount would presumably be split evenly between the two Endowments. The rationale for this was difficult for the U.S.O.E. staff to understand, but theoretically these funds were to be used for educational projects and programs to be developed jointly by both agencies but administered by the Endowments. In fiscal 1969, $100,000 was transferred to the Endowment for the Arts for such purposes; in fiscal 1970, it now appears that $1.8 million is being transferred from the Bureau of Research to the National Foundation, where each Endowment will get $900,000 each. This action had not yet been implemented by early May.

It would seem that some bureaucratic infighting has been going on, and that the U.S.O.E. Arts and Humanities Program has suffered somewhat as a result. In any event, nearly $2 million of education agency money seems about to be given over to another agency, and this in a year when allocations for AHP itself have fallen to their lowest point since 1965.

Finally, in a move which is largely unrelated to any of the above issues, the staff of the Arts and Humanities Program recently announced what appears to be a major shift in programmatic emphasis and objectives. Essentially, it seems to indicate a major departure from the former project-by-project approach which emphasized improvements in each of the major subject-matter areas of the arts and humanities; instead, from now on, according to a recent Program Bulletin: "the Program's major thrust is to provide support for a few carefully selected comprehensive development projects which will have, as their motivating force, the humanization of learning through the arts." At the same time, apparently, the Program will make an attempt to implement the findings of significant research and development projects it has supported in the past.

It is too soon to comment on this development, because the announcement of the change in aims has not had time to produce a response from the field in terms of new proposals. With the present year regarded as transitional -- in which to begin gradually phasing out projects initiated under the former philosophy -- and with the current constriction on available funds, it will be some time before the Program can implement the new objectives in solid programmatic demonstrations. Nonetheless, the concern for developments which seek to bring about "the humanization of learning through the arts" seems to me both reasonable and realistic, given the temper of the educational times and the conditions likely to be required for the arts genuinely to flourish in the schools. I will try to confront this issue more directly in the final section of this report, out from under the specific context of the Arts and Humanities Program or Title IV of ESEA.

NOTE: In a recent organizational change in the Office of Education, Commissioner Allen created a new unit called The National Center for Educational Research and Development (NCERD). NCERD supercedes the former Bureau of Research and has been given responsibility for Office-wide research and development activities. The Arts and Humanities Program continues as a staff agency within the National Center.

## Title V (State Education Agencies)

Title V's purposes were to stimulate and assist the states in strengthening the leadership resources of their education agencies (that is, of state departments of education), and to aid them in establishing and improving programs to identify and meet their educational needs.

Once again, the authorizations zoomed from $25 million in 1966 to $80 million in 1979 -- but the appropriations lagged far, far behind; they started at $17 million in 1966 and had crept up only to $29.75 million two years later.

For the most part, when these funds were utilized by state education departments for arts and humanities purposes, it was to augment the state agency's supervisory or consulting staffs, according to a survey of state agencies conducted in connection with this report. This survey -- undertaken mainly with the help of state Title III coordinators -- is not complete at this writing; questionnaires and reporting forms have not been received from fifteen states, but some general trends can nonetheless be discerned from the thirty-five states which have returned their forms to us. (We are still attempting to obtain data from the remaining fifteen states.)

Thirteen state agencies (among the initial group of thirty-five respondents) indicate that Title V money enabled them to add either an art supervisor or a music supervisor. Only two other states point to any alternate methods of utilizing Title V funds for the arts: Pennsylvania underwrote preliminary funding for a statewide curriculum development program in the related arts, and Arkansas supported the initial costs of a traveling artmobile for a rural section of the state. And that seems to be it -- so far. Obviously, at this rate, a relatively minute proportion of the five-year Title V appropriations will end up being used by the state agencies to expand arts and humanities education in their respective states.

* * *

In separate sections of the survey referred to above, we asked for information of a general nature relative to arts and humanities education in state education agencies. From this data, a somewhat clearer picture emerges of the status and intent of these agencies with respect to the arts and humanities.

Based on responses from slightly over two-thirds of the states, the survey indicates that only 11 states have a specific administrative unit in their state education agencies that is concerned with arts and humanities education. There are four professional staff members in the units of four of these 11 states; four other states list three staff people; two others have two staff people; and two more have one person on the professional staff. With respect to the disciplines represented among the staffs of these units, six states have art and music supervisors only; four have supervisors of art, music and social studies; and one has a humanities specialist. (This data, incidentally, does not include, as yet, responses from several states, including New York, where it is known that such units have indeed been established.)

Of the 23 states which reported that they did not have a specific administrative unit for arts and humanities education, 20 indicated that it was unlikely that such a unit would be established in the near future. Only one state (Oklahoma) said it was likely; two other states didn't know.

Of these same 23 states not represented by a special administrative unit, some nevertheless do have supervisors in one or more arts disciplines attached to or working out of a larger administrative division: eleven states, among this group, indicated that they employed art and music supervisors; 3 indicated positions for art, music, and the humanities; 2 indicated positions for art, music, theatre, and the humanities. Five states had no positions at all in this field of education.

If these figures hold up proportionately when the remaining fifteen states send us their data, it would appear that although perhaps 25% of the states may now have special administrative units emphasizing the arts and humanities, only a handful are going much beyond the traditional approach to the arts in the schools: that is, they are staffing up so as to represent statewide concerns in art and music, and little else.

There are only three states, to my knowledge, which have gone substantially beyond this: New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey. New York, of course, moved into a commanding position with respect to official state emphasis on the arts and humanities several years ago when then-Commissioner Allen created the Division of the Humanities and the Arts within the New York State Education Department. Dr. Vivienne Anderson and a staff of five or six education specialists in the arts and humanities have since developed a broad capability few other states can even conceive of -- and none, with the possible exception of Pennsylvania and New Jersey, are close to implementing.

With the same few exceptions, it appears that none of the state education agencies are anywhere near ready to consider putting additional state funds at the disposal of the schools for arts and humanities purposes.

* * *

Thus, for all but a few states -- which managed to pull themselves up to a status quo position by hiring art and music supervisors -- Title V funds seem to have left the state education agencies pretty much where they found them, with respect to arts and humanities concerns and capabilities. The single major exception to this is that Title III projects in the arts did tend to develop considerable interest and expertese in these matters on the part of some of the state agency program officers who had little previous acquaintance with the arts in the schools. It's a gain -- though, to be sure, a very, very small one.

## Teacher Education under NDEA, NFAHA and EPDA

Other than the several titles of ESEA already discussed, the major legislation administered by the Office of Education bearing on the humanities and the arts at the pre-college level has been the National Defense Education Act of 1958 (NDEA), Section 13 of the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965 (NFAHA), and the Education Professions Development Act of 1967 (EPDA).

In actuality, only the latter two acts have any application to the creative and performing arts -- and even in those instances the amounts have been of little fiscal significance. In rough terms, we're talking about a total of perhaps $3.7 million for all of the teacher training programs mentioned above during the entire period from 1965 to the present. (Compare that to $200 million for three years of Title I.)

### NDEA

NDEA applied only to the traditional humanistic disciplines (the non-arts subject matter fields), even after the original act was amended and somewhat broadened in 1964. And, for the most part, it supported so-called "institutes of advanced study" whose purpose was to re-train teachers and thereby "improve the quality of instruction in the nation's elementary and secondary schools." Principally, these institutes were conducted in the summer on the campuses of colleges and universities; they lasted anywhere from two to eight or nine weeks, and drew their participants either from the immediate local area or from a regional or national matrix.

## NFAHA (Section 13)

When the National Foundation Act (NFAHA) was passed in 1965, it contained a bold verbal provision aimed at rectifying the omission of the arts from NDEA institutes but provided little money to do it with. Section 13 of NFAHA was designed, via the institute route, "to improve the qualification of individuals engaged in, or preparing to engage in, the teaching or supervising or training of teachers of subjects which will strengthen the teaching of the humanities and the arts in elementary and secondary schools." That's a complex government sentence but it simply means that teachers and supervisors in the creative and performing arts could now qualify for training or re-training in NDEA-type institutes. Once again, these institutes were all conducted in the summer, and colleges and universities were the major sites, recruiting their participants locally, regionally, or nationally.

The NFAHA-supported institutes were held for three summers, beginning in 1966; in 1969, an expanded institute program was inaugurated under the broad new provisions of EPDA. In all, 34 institutes were supported involving a total of about 1150 teachers and supervisors at a cost of half a million dollars for each of the three years.

Proposals were submitted by higher education institutions to a unit of the Office of Education concerned with teacher education (not the Arts and Humanities Program in the Bureau of Research). Screening and final selection was done with the assistance of a panel of consultants from all of the relevant disciplines and, with a limited pot of money, it was apparent that an attempt was made to spread the bounty around both geographically and by subject fields. An analysis of these 34 institutes reveals that:

* 11 institutes for 430 teachers were conducted in 1966, 12 for 385 teachers in 1967, and 11 for 335 teachers in 1968;
* participants were mostly teachers, although supervisors in the arts disciplines were involved in a few institutes;
* about 75% of the teachers were from the secondary level, until the last year when the division was about even;
* music, art, theatre, dance, and screen education each captured one or two institutes each summer;
* categories variously called Interdisciplinary Humanities, Related Arts or Aesthetic Education came up with a combined total of four or five each summer; and
* Latin, of all things, had one institute devoted to it each of the three summers!

In these ways, then, a total of $1.5 million was spent on the re-education of (mainly) secondary school teachers under the provisions of NFAHA.

Short of some systematic follow-up surveys and interviews, it is difficult to make any substantive judgments about the quality of training, its impact and lasting value, or indeed whether it was worth the money or not, in the long run. (The average cost was slightly less than $50,000 per institute, and about $1,000 per teacher.)

My inclination is to think it was worth the money, all in all; certainly it was a long-overdue attempt to bring about improvements in teaching fields not eligible under previous federal programs aiding teacher education. On the other hand, eleven or twelve summer institutes a year involving about 400 teachers from a wide range of artistic and humanistic fields can hardly be termed a major attack on the problem; in terms of theatre education alone, for example, some 125 elementary and secondary teachers participated in a total of four institutes. Somehow, if this matter of teacher education (either pre-service or in-service) is to be taken seriously in the aesthetic disciplines, something more far-reaching than this must be done.

Furthermore, I must confess to a certain uneasiness about the concept of "summer institutes," in the first place. I wonder whether it's really possible for the average teacher (if there is such a person) to ingest enough in three or four weeks in the summer to change or improve what he does in the classroom very profoundly -- particularly, if none of his institute colleagues are from his own school. An institute aiming only at suggesting subject matter changes or new resources, or simply at supplementing the usual curriculum with some helpful new ("interdisciplinary") ideas for "turning the kids on" would probably result in some general improvements when the teacher returns to the classroom in the fall. Moreover, he wouldn't be apt to need the reinforcement of his fellow teachers to accomplish this sort of thing. But if he is interested in substantially different approaches to working with children, with perhaps radical ways of teaching and learning, and if he really gets such concepts in the institute, he will find they often tend to fade away under administrative indifference or active supervisory opposition unless there are others who have had similar re-training experiences and can therefore join with him to make common cause for change. The limited funding (resulting in a limited group of institutes for a limited number of teachers) seldom made it possible for more than one teacher from a given school, or even a given area, to attend these NFAHA-supported institutes. This is one of the deficiencies in the teacher education programs that seem to have been remedied substantially under EPDA.

## EPDA

With the passage of the Education Professions Development Act in 1967, a number of changes and improvements were, in fact, made in federal programs supporting activities dealing with teacher education. In part it was an integrative act, bringing together (under the coordinated administration of the newly-established Bureau of Educational Personnel Development) the institute programs, academic year fellowships, the Teachers Corps and, in fact, all relevant federal programs for educational personnel. And significantly unlike the earlier, more categorical measures, EPDA makes it possible for the Commissioner of Education to reassesss priorities throughout the field as needs change, and to take discretionary action when he believes it is required.

In essence, the new act aims at helping the entire educational system (including state education agencies, colleges and universities, as well as local school districts) to develop more effective ways of recruiting, training, retraining, and utilizing the whole spectrum of educational personnel.

According to recent announcements, EPDA projects differ in three important respects from those funded under earlier federal teacher training programs: first, they place heavy, though not exclusive, emphasis on the preparation or retraining of people who work with disadvantaged or handicapped youngsters; second, they place far less emphasis on specific subject areas than formerly and focus instead on generalized fields such as pupil personnel services (i.e. guidance and counseling) and early childhood education where manpower shortages are most severe; and third, projects funded under EPDA reflect a major shift away from the exclusively college-based training activities, which were primarily short-term in nature, to an emphasis on long-term projects which rely on consortium or partnership arrangements between higher educational institutions, local school systems, and the communities to be served by the people in training. This does not mean that all EPDA projects now recruit participants from a limited, primarily local, geographic area; although this has now become a high priority concern -- and rightly so, in my judgment -- there are still many projects which recruit the people to be trained on a state, regional, or national basis.

Although EPDA was enacted in the summer of 1967, much of the year following was concerned with staffing up the new Bureau of Educational Personnel Development (called BEPD, naturally) and with planning and coordination matters. Funding for new programs the first year was minimal.

When the planning period came to an end, the news out of BEPD was that its operational activities had been broken down into ten or eleven different programs -- in such areas as Basic Studies, Career Opportunities, Early Childhood, Educational Administration, Trainers of Teacher Trainers (the so-called Triple-T Program), Support Personnel (Media Specialists), and so on. Requested funding levels in its budget depended somewhat on the severity of the manpower shortages in each area, although all operational units set high priority on projects directed specifically at those educational groups working with disadvantaged children.

Virtually all of the above program categories could be said to relate to the training of people in the aesthetic and humanistic fields; as it turned out, however, these concerns were primarily represented in the

Basic Studies Program. This program "supports projects... concerned with learning more about a particular academic discipline and how to teach it in the schools." Its objectives are "to increase the supply of teachers in subject areas with known shortages of personnel and to improve the subject matter competency of teachers."

The institutes and academic year projects in the arts and humanities supported under the Basic Studies Program did not actually get under way until the summer of 1969; the amount of support was over twice that under previous programs: a total of $1,267,200. Overall, some twenty-two projects in this field were approved, including sixteen summer and part-time academic year institutes at a cost of $624,600, three experienced teacher fellowships at $441,600, and three pre-service fellowships at $201,000.

According to information provided by BEPD, these projects have some of the following characteristics:

- Over one-fourth of the projects combine the resources of community, state, and federally-funded programs;
- Interagency cooperation is a significant aspect of three projects;
- Eight projects are designed for or include leadership personnel (administrators, teacher trainers, supervisors and principals);
- Almost half the projects will effect changes in the way

interdisciplinary subject matter (or specific subject matter) are taught in the schools; of these ten, two projects will influence the selection of curriculum content in the schools;

* Ten projects are primarily designed for disadvantaged youth; five of these are concerned with the problems of black students;
* Eight of the projects will train teachers from disadvantaged urban areas;
* Ten will train teachers from rural disadvantaged areas, nine of these ten will draw some or all of their participants from the Black, Mexican-American, Indian, Puerto Rican, or Appalachian disadvantaged groups.

My own personal analysis of this initial series of projects is a little less ecstatic than the Bureau's. It indicates that, of the sixteen projects its announcement lumped together as "summer and part-time academic year institutes," only one project was of the latter type; fifteen appear still to be supportive of the theory that training and retraining can be effectively conducted in a few weeks during the summer. It may simply be the limitations on funding that produce such a pattern, since it's obviously cheaper to go the summer route than the part-time academic year route.

An analysis of these summer institutes, furthermore, gives me the feeling that little has changed in the general approach; we still find major emphasis on improvement in subject-matter competence rather than in the manner of teaching, and there is a heavy concentration on improvement in individual subject areas as against interdisciplinary or related approaches. Of the fifteen summer institutes four were in theatre education, three in music, three in art (a total of ten), while two others made an attempt to integrate art and music in some way. Two more seem to have been genuinely involved in interdisciplinary activities, with a third following this approach by concentrating on Afro-American studies relating literature, the arts and the social studies.

The single part-time academic year project was, to be sure, a Unified Humanities Program, mainly for secondary teachers from the state of Kentucky. The three pre-service fellowship projects offered assistance to prospective teachers at all educational levels; two were in art education for students holding BFA degrees, and one was in music education for performing musicians with an AB degree.

One of the two experienced teacher fellowship projects was a Music Supervisors Training Program for K - 12 teachers who were music majors; the other was the most interesting of the lot -- a program entitled "Retraining Teachers of Music, Art, and Literature to Function as Instructional Teams" being conducted for secondary teachers at George Peabody College for Teachers in Nashville.

* * *

The picture for the current fiscal year in the Basic Studies Program where most of EPDA's activities reside with respect to the arts and humanities, is a little confused. Early in the year -- last September, in fact -- Don Davies, the Associate Commissioner for Educational Personnel Development announced a "series of specific reductions in planned programs" in line with the administration's decision to reduce federal expenditures all across the board. The decision was made that the Basic Studies Program would absorb $8 million of the overall DHEW cutback. As a result, Dr. Davies stated flatly that "proposals for that program cannot be accepted this year."

This action affected virtually all of the programs directed toward the field of the arts and humanities. This suspension of activity continued throughout most of the current academic year for projects which normally would have begun this coming summer and continued throughout fiscal 1971.

Suddenly, however, a few months ago -- and for reasons I have not been able to have clarified in any detail -- $4 million of the $8 million reduction was restored; furthermore, four general areas of emphasis were to receive one million dollars each of the restored amount. The arts and humanities turned out to be one of those fields.

This situation contained all the usual elements associated with federal spending: after nearly eight months of no action at all, the funds were suddenly made available again, and there remained perhaps four months of the current fiscal year to decide what ought to be done with them and then to go through all the necessary procedures to get the money obligated before June 30th. What those in charge of the Basic Studies Program decided to do was to ask the four major professional arts education associations for suggestions about how this million dollars ought to be spent. The specialist staff of the Arts and Humanities Program in the Bureau of Research were invited, together with representatives of the two Endowments, to attend a meeting with officials of the four associations: The American Educational Theatre Association, the Music Educators National Conference, the National Art Education Association, and the association of health and physical education teachers which has for years represented the interests of dance education.

The outcome of this meeting was a decision to seek the advice of still another segment of the educational establishment, the state education agencies. Each chief state school officer was asked to select two school systems in his state which, in his opinion, would be likely sites in which to establish demonstration programs concerned with in-service training for teachers in the arts on an interdisciplinary basis. The state agency's suggestions were to be regarded as virtual applications to BEPD for use of these funds. It was understood that the million dollars would ultimately support perhaps five projects, at an average of about $200,000 per site -- the money to be spread over several years, if the applicant desired.

The suggestions came in, two from each state, and were reviewed by the association representatives, with the advice of OE staff members from the teacher education program and the Arts and Humanities Program.

As this is being written, the announcement of this program has just been made -- in a news release from the National Education Association (which houses both MENC and NAEA). The release calls the five-site program "a million dollar experiment in using the arts -- dance, drama, music, the visual arts -- to improve the total educational climate of the schools".

Referred to as "Arts Impact" (for 'Interdisciplinary Model Programs in the Arts for Children and Teachers'), the project will be conducted in a middle school in the Philadelphia Public Schools, in a rural two-county area of Alabama, and in the schools of Glendale (California), Eugene (Oregon), and Columbus (Ohio). The news release describes the objectives of the program, as outlined by a U.S.O.E. spokesman, in terms that suggest the projects are in many ways merely all-purpose arts projects in the Title III vein. (Teacher retraining, as much, seems merely to be one of several elements in the overall conception.)

However, this whole project-oriented approach to the matter of teacher preparation and retraining -- whether in the arts or any other field -- raises some very complicated questions. The concentration on a few sites, the interdisciplinary mix, the concern for a more humane learning environment, and the recognition that changes in the way the arts are taught depend chiefly on the development of good teachers -- all these are definite plusses, in my view. But the limited amount of money, the lack of assurance respecting continuity, the haste with which the whole process was undertaken --

these aspects trouble me. Further, I am in a mood to question the demonstration program as a concept, anyway -- or at least to probe its present viability for this kind of hasty approach to the spending of a million dollars.

I presume, however, that we will need to wait a bit and see what happens before taking such speculation, pro or con, any further.

## Other OE-Administered Legislation with Limited Applicability

In so far as federal education programs with implications for the arts are concerned, there are only three other major peices of legislation that might be mentioned. One really has no bearing at all on programs at the elementary and secondary level of education; the second is almost impossible to tie definitely to developments in arts education; and the third has provided considerable opportunity which has never been taken advantage of with respect to arts programs. They seem worth at least a passing comment, however, before moving on to programs administered outside the U. S. Office of Education.

### The Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963

This act has nothing to do with pre-college activities in the arts. But, as has been alluded to at the beginning of this report, it has probably supported quite a good deal of arts-related construction on graduate and undergraduate campuses since it was enacted seven years ago. The appropriations have been substantial and, surprisingly, up to 1967 they appear to have kept pace with their original authorizations -- at least at the undergraduate level. The authorization for grants for construction of undergraduate academic facilities was $463 million in fiscal 1966; its appropriation was $460 million! In 1967, the authorization was $482 million; the appropriation remained at $460 million. In fiscal 1968, a reversal seems to have set in: $735 million was authorized, but only $274 million appropriated.

In any event, the proportion of these sums -- and the less substantial amounts provided for graduate level facilities -- which might have been spent for fine arts facilities is apt to have been considerable. I have not attempted to track the actual statistics down because the issue is beyond the scope of the present study, but it might be interesting some time to try to find out what the figures actually are. I believe the author of the 1966 article in Reporter magazine included as much as $15 or $20 million from this source in her estimate of the total Office of Education spending on the arts that year. If one includes such eligible items as studios, classrooms, libraries, and performance facilities (not designed mainly for events at which admission is charged), plus composites such as fine arts centers, this may well be a reasonable estimate.

## The "Impacted Areas" Legislation

There are two separate acts which fall in this category, one concerned with school construction and the other with general financial assistance to schools in areas affected by federal activities. This refers to the fact that, in many localities such as those in the vicinity of Washington, D.C., there are many parcels of land which are exempt from local taxation due to the presence of federal buildings and activities. Therefore, to compensate schools for these tax losses, federal grants averaging about 5 to 6%

of total current maintenance and operating expenditures are awarded school systems in such areas -- with virtually no restrictions on their use. It is quite frankly regarded as general aid by most schools and is simply included as part of their annual operating budgets. School construction funds are similarly awarded to districts in such circumstances, but on a more complicated formula and in far less substantial amounts.

No one, I suspect, has been either interested in or able to find out how these funds have been spent by school districts across the country. Some of it presumably has purchased facilities, services, materials and equipment related to the arts -- and, while it would be useless to speculate how much, it is an element of federal assistance to the schools which is often overlooked by the general public because it has no categorical implications. It is legislation which also has come under legitimate attack year after year because it rewards the richer districts (such as Montgomery County, Md.) on the same basis as the poorer districts. But, while everybody decries it (including a succession of presidents), few congressmen are willing to vote for its reduction or elimination.

## The Vocational Education Legislation

Over the years a number of federal measures have been enacted to support aspects of vocational education. The most recent and coordinated effort along these lines took place in 1963 when the Vocational Education Act was passed. The major provisions of VEA authorize grants to states to help them improve existing programs and to develop new programs of vocational education. The program is administered by the states (not U.S.O.E.), and a state board of vocational education contracts with local public school systems or with other agencies to implement state plans.

Obviously, little has been done by state administrators or those running local vocational schools to incorporate technical courses relating to the arts -- the crafts of the theatre, for example, from seamstresses to stage carpenters, or certain technical occupations associated with museums. Aside from a rather out-dated and limited Labor Department survey, I know of no major career-ladder study to determine nationally the manpower needs in these occupational fields, or of the training steps and requirements associated with them. Until such a study is made, it seems unlikely that local administrators or state planners of vocational education programs will offer arts-related vocational courses -- even though the opportunity is there to use some of the federal aid "to develop new programs".

In 1968 total allocations made to the states under this legislation came to $198 million. It seems a pity no one is channeling some of it into fields related vocationally to the arts.

## Programs Administered by Other Agencies which Support Arts-in-Education Activities

Clearly, programs administered by the U.S. Office of Education have, in recent years, provided the great bulk of the funds to support arts projects and activities at the pre-college level of education. There are, however, at least three other federal agencies which have staked out modest claims in this field. Their primary missions are not specifically educational, so the sums of money they have invested in the arts in educational settings and for educational purposes is low in proportion to their total program allocations and expenditures. But these three agencies -- the National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities, the Office of Economic Opportunity, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development -- administer programs which cannot be overlooked in any review of federal aid bearing on the arts in education.

The National Foundation, established in 1965 when the landmark arts and humanities legislation was enacted, really functions in programmatic terms through its twin endowments -- the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities, each of which has its own national council of Presidentially-appointed advisors. A Federal Council on the Arts and Humanities coordinates the work of the two endowments and serves to relate their activities to other federal agencies and programs.

The missions of the two Endowments are quite distinct, in terms of Congressional intent. In the broadest sense, the Humanities Endowment is concerned with the promotion of scholarship in all aspects of the humanities (including the creative and performing arts) while the Arts Endowment is concerned specifically with the growth and development of the creative and performing arts themselves. The Chairman of the Humanities Endowment, Barnaby Keeney, once distinguished between the functions of the two Endowments by observing whimsically that "if you do it, it's the arts; if you study it, it's the humanities." Although in aspects of their program operations this distinction has tended to become slightly blurred, it is nonetheless true that the two Endowments function in very different ways and deal day-to-day with very different constituencies. They will therefore be reviewed separately here.

## The National Endowment for the Arts

The Arts Endowment's major mission is "to support the development and growth of the arts throughout the United States and to provide opportunities for wider appreciation of the arts and the encouragement of excellence." It does this principally through across-the-board support of the institutions of the arts and of individual artists engaged in special projects. It has operated on a yearly appropriation, for its regular grant programs and pilot projects, which has never risen above $4.5 million. Total appropriations for the five-year period 1966-70 come to only $18.9 million -- less than the Ford Foundation customarily allocates annually for somewhat similar purposes.

It does, however, have access to two other kinds of appropriations which brighten the picture slightly. For the last four years, it has operated a state assistance program -- consisting of matching grants to official state arts agencies -- which has averaged slightly under $2 million annually. And it has also been authorized to use a modest allocation of federal funds to match donations and gifts of one sort or another; this has amounted to about $6 million over the five-year period and has obviously been used to considerable effect as a lever to pry loose non-federal funds for specific arts-related purposes -- totaling perhaps three or four times the original sum.

Where, within the broad outlines of this programmatic effort, have educational concerns been accomodated? The table on the following page gives some idea of the Arts Endowment's funding pattern concerning projects, programs and activities which have been related to the educational experiences of young people. It shows that a total of about $2.9 million has been spent on such activities during the last five years. (This includes nearly $955,000 which appears to have been concerned with programs for young people of college age or above -- in grants to assist an experimental in-residence college tour of the Joffrey Ballet; to support the work of poets in developing (primarily black) colleges; to provide travel and research stipends for undergraduate architecture students; and to help architectural schools undertake environmental design projects.) This $2.9 million is about

## National Endowment for the Arts

### Expenditures for Educational Purposes, 1966-70

| | 1966 | 1967 | 1968 | 1969 | 1970 | TOTALS | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Elem.-Sec. Education Projects | 46,750 | 116,930 | 110,940 | 36,400 | 232,000 | 543,000 | |
| Educational Laboratory Theatre Program | 36,500 | 681,000 | 134,750 | 333,750 | 165,000 | 1,351,000 | |
| Other Education Projects | -- | 54,000 | 33,218 | 411,100 | 456,400 | 954,718 | |
| U.S.O.E. Transfer Funds | -- | -- | -- | 100,000 | * | 100,000 | |
| | $83,250 | $851,930 | $278,908 | $981,250 | $853,400 | $2,948,738 | (15-16% of total program allocation) |
| Social Development Grants | 8,764 | 107,000 | 235,000 | 71,250 | 30,000 | 452,014 | |

SUMMARY:

--- Total NEFA Elem & Sec. Educ Expenditures (Lab Theatre included): $1,894,000 (10% of total allocation)

--- Total (including U.S.O.E. funds): $1,994,000 (.105%)

--- Total NEFA Expenditures for Education - all levels (not including Lab Theatre): $1,597,738 (.08%)

---

* Arrangements have been completed (but no official action taken on it by mid-May) for transfer of $900,000 from U.S.O.E. to NEFA in FY 1969.

15-16% of the Endowment's total five-year allocation.

Support of activities bearing directly on education at the elementary and secondary levels comes to nearly $2 million (including $100,000 transferred to the Endowment from the Office of Education in 1969). In relative terms, between 10-11% of the five-year budget has been allocated to such projects.

The Educational Laboratory Theatre Program has spanned the entire five years of the Endowment's existence and accounts for nearly half of the agency's total educational expenditures -- and two-thirds of its programmatic effort at the elementary and secondary level. Funds totaling $1,351,000 have been spent on this program, mainly to support directly the production costs of the three professional resident companies -- in Providence, New Orleans, and Los Angeles. In effect, these monies expanded the companies' capabilities to enable them to present about 160 extra performances each year for virtually all the high school students in their localities. As noted in the earlier section concerned with Title IV of ESEA, the Endowment's funds were supplemented by grants from the Office of Education under both Title III and Title IV to make this three-city program fully operational for three years in each locality. The Los Angeles project is now in its final year under federal support, with the Endowment's grant of $165,000 going to the Inner City Cultural Center for productions reaching all 12th grade students in the Los Angeles city schools.

A similar purpose seems to have been served by a series of grants made this year (fiscal '70) to six symphony orchestras and an opera company, although apparently with far less chance of regular interaction between these organizations and the schools than was the case with the laboratory theatre companies. These grants are accounted for in the $456,000 listed under 1970 as "Other Education Projects" on the accompanying table. Essentially, the grants provide operational support for these symphony organizations -- but when they were encouraged to submit proposals which went beyond general support needs, these organizations requested funds to undertake a variety of special educational service programs. Youth concerts in the schools, special concerts for underprivileged children, summer workshops with students, and a statewide project involving 2000 Utah high school children in choral group performances with the symphony, are among the several ways these organizations intend to use the Endowment funds. However, because of the general lack of performance continuity in any single school system, and because these programs were not solely directed toward the education of school-age youngsters, I have not included the $450,000 as a clear-cut elementary and secondary education expense, on the accompanying expenditure table.

The remaining $543,000 which the Endowment has used to date, to support education-related projects at the pre-college level, seems to have been allocated to three general fields: programs concerned with expanding the role of poetry in the schools (far the largest, at $209,750); a 1967 project at Fordham to improve teaching methods by using films to heighten communication with minority group high school students ($71,000); and a two-year $91,400 project to enable ten young musicians to study the Kodaly concept of music education in Hungary during 1968-69. Currently pending, out of 1970 funds, is a $100,000 grant to the College Entrance Examination Board to develop advanced placement courses in art and music. A grant of $25,000 has been made recently to the ES-70 School Systems, a nationwide consortium of sixteen highly diverse school systems established with Office of Education support and engaged in a long-range program to develop a more relevant high school curriculum; the Endowment's grant matches a grant from the JDR 3rd Fund to design and coordinate the arts components of this new curriculum.

Finally, the present year's activity in the elementary and secondary education field included a $45,000 grant to the CEMREL educational research and development laboratory in St. Louis for a Visual Artist-in-Residence Program. CEMREL had been the recipient of the $100,000 which, in fiscal '69, was transferred from the Office of Education to the Endowment for joint projects in the arts in education. Discussions between the two agencies resulted in a decision that CEMREL would administer and monitor a project which placed young visual artists in year-round residence in six school systems across the country. The latest grant of $45,000 will enable CEMREL to produce a motion picture about the program for use with state arts councils and education agencies. (The artists represented, incidentally, turned out to be three sculptors, a painter, an enameling craftsman, and a water-colorist.)

Another aspect of the Endowment's program which, for the most part, bears indirectly on education has to do with its social development grants in the arts -- variously referred to as "the ghetto arts program," "the inner city arts program," or, as Roger Stevens usually put it: those projects having to do with "the sociological aspects of the arts." There have been twelve major, identifiable projects in this category which have been supported by the Arts Endowment since 1966; they range from a $5000 matching grant to George Washington University this year to support Workshops for Careers in the Arts (for talented inner city high school students) to the 12-city Inner City Arts Workshops for disadvantaged youngsters in the summer of 1968, which utilized the Endowment's matching fund to double a $200,000 federal investment. The table on page 89 indicates that the five-year total of expenditures for this program area was $452,000.

Among the other projects in this field which have educational implications are several made to institutions which function outside the formal school system: a $25,000 grant in 1969 to Colin Carew's New Thing Art and Architecture Center in Washington, D.C. to experiment with an arts-oriented high school for urban (mainly non-white) students; grants totaling $52,700 to Dorothy Maynor's Harlem School of the Arts to support dance, art, music, and threatre training programs for ghetto youngsters; and a $3500 emergency grant to Elma Lewis' School of Fine Arts in Boston to help Miss Lewis' Roxbury program survive in a period of financial crisis.

It is characteristic of almost all of these projects, and the others as well, that they are designed primarily to benefit young people of school and college age, and that they attempt in various ways to fill unmet educational as well as social and artistic needs. If, for these reasons, they might be regarded as activities relating to the arts in education, primarily involving youngsters of public school age, the Endowment's total investment in this general field would be nearer to $1 million -- and to about $2.3 million if the Educational Laboratory Theatre Program were included.

At present, the Endowment staff and members of the National Council on the Arts are still attempting to define more precisely the Endowment's responsibilities in this field, and to resolve the complicated policy questions involved. Undoubtedly, its activities in the social development area would have been greater had it received more substantial Congressional appropriations; the same thing can also be said, of course, about its activities vis a vis the arts in education. If it obtains the $20 million appropriation for fiscal 1971 requested by President Nixon, it seems likely to me that allocations for both of these somewhat intertwined program categories will be increased -- though precisely what kinds of projects will be supported cannot yet be discerned. A few clues about this, however, may be found in current speculation by the Endowment staff concerning how the agency intends to utilize some long-anticipated transfer funds from the Office of Education this year.

Arrangements have been worked out to continue for a second year -- and at a greatly increased level -- the precedent set by the $100,000 transfer of funds from U.S.O.E. to the Endowment in 1969. A letter sent early in

January from Commissioner Allen to the chairmen of both Endowments stated that it was the intent of the Office of Education to transfer $1.8 million from OE's educational research budget for fiscal 1970 to the National Foundation for joint experimental projects; presumably this sum would be divided equally between the Endowments, giving each $900,000 in additional funds for educational projects in the arts -- and in the humanities. As of the middle of May, however, the transfer had not been officially accomplished and there was even some doubt that it would actually come to pass by the fiscal deadline, June 30th.[5]

If the transfer does take place, the Endowment's plans for utilizing the funds (presumably worked out with Office of Education arts officials) appear to take the following forms: 1) to augment the educational components of existing Endowment-supported programs such as the "poetry-in-the-schools" project, the dance touring company, and the school performance capabilities of the symphonies, opera companies, and resident theatre groups; 2) to fund some of the more imaginative plans submitted by the state arts councils seeking to initiate or extend local, state, or regional arts-in-education projects. It seems likely that the Endowment will begin seriously to confront the whole artists-in-the schools concept by experimenting broadly, across a wide range of art forms, with more effective ways for artists and students to interact.

All of which brings to the fore the role of the state arts agencies with respect to the arts in education. It is my personal view that the last three or four years have been a period of extraordinary "training" and development on the part of state arts officials, and of the executive directors and their staffs in particular. In no aspect of their work has this been more noticeable than in the knowledge they exhibit about other federal programs (particularly those in education), their sophistication in developing plans and proposals for tapping these programs, and in the broadened perspective they reveal when they hammer out their own budget allocations. Increasingly, it seems to me, they have become concerned about, if not deeply committed to, the development of programs which seek out ways of relating the arts to the educational experiences of young people -- either formally by touring productions to the schools, or informally in classrooms, workshops and festivals, where artists can interact with students.

The Associated Councils of the Arts, as a prelude to its May conference on the arts in education, has recently conducted a national survey of the educational programs of state arts agencies. I hope to be able to attach* to this report a copy of the results of this survey; it may confirm descriptively or statistically the feeling I have expressed above, although I would be surprised to find that, on a national basis, more than 10% of these state arts council funds are going into school-related projects. The trend may be upward, however -- from virtually nothing the first several years to a relatively higher proportion of total funds the last couple of years. This will not turn out to be a great deal of money, to be sure -- not when two-thirds of the state councils have been unable to fashion an annual operating budget of over $100,000! But the amount of dollars may not, in this instance, be

*See Note, page 105.

a true indication of the degree of interest in this field which has developed on the part of the agency directors. In fact, there appears to be interest everywhere in officialdom in the role of the arts in education -- from President Nixon, Nancy Hanks, and Commissioner Allen on down. But it seems to me that, in the long run, it may be the state arts council executives who will prove to be key agents in translating this interest into active and imaginative programs. And they may play an even greater role in terms of generating increased understanding about the needs of education in the arts -- and the needs of the arts in society generally. They and the agencies they represent may turn out, ultimately, to be the most important force the Endowment has unleashed to support the arts in education generally.

## The National Endowment for the Humanities

The Humanities Endowment does not fall precisely within the scope of this report -- for several reasons; first, its concerns are directed more toward the broad dimensions of humanistic development than to creative and artistic development; when it has concerned itself with the arts, it has -- quite properly -- been more interested in their study than in their practice. Second, for the most part, the focus of the Humanities Endowment has been on research and on scholarly studies -- and this has meant that its programs, and thus its funding patterns, have been oriented more toward the higher and adult educational levels than toward the elementary and secondary schools.

Nevertheless, its education program has since 1967 had a category labeled "Elementary and Secondary Education." As the table on the following page shows, expenditures in this category are only slightly shy of a million

## National Endowment for the Humanities

### Expenditures for Educational Purposes, 1966-70*

| | 1966 | 1967 | 1968 | 1969 | 1970** | TOTALS |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Elem.-Secondary Projects (under the Education Program) | NA[1] | 190,650 | 87,060 | 400,266[2] | 293,490[4] | 971,466 |
| Other Education Program Expenditures | 782,000 | 81,500 | 595,940 | 1,501,723 | NA | 2,961,163 |
| | $782,000 | $272,150 | $683,000 | $1,901,989[3] | ($293,490) | $3,932,629 |

[1] Reporting categories did not break figures down by level; assume some part of $782,000 went for Elem.-Sec. projects

[2] Includes $113,401 available through gifts & U.S. Treasury matching (outright grants: $286,865)

[3] Includes $536,400 " " " " " " ( " " : $1,252,188)

[4] Includes $30,000 " " " " " " ( " " : $263,490)

* Does not include Planning & Development Program expenditures totaling $158,000 in FY 1968 & 1969 to support the National Humanities Faculty project, nor $34,330 in FY 1969 for the Commission on Humanities in the Schools (both of which were essentially directed to improvements in humanities education at the elementary and secondary levels). Another $150-200,000 is expected to be allocated from FY 1970 funds to continue the Humanities Faculty program.

** Unofficial preliminary estimates only; by May, 1970, only $190,000 had been officially allocated.

dollars for the four-year period, 1967-70; (it may also be that part of the $782,000 listed as "Other Education Program Expenditures" in fiscal 1966 went for projects of this nature -- but the available line-item breakdowns make no mention of it).

The principal way in which the Humanities Endowment impinges on the domain of the public schools is by supporting activities for the improvement of teaching in the humanities at these levels. It has also supported curriculum development activities in the humanities, such as the work at the Educational Development Center in Massachusetts where a unit on Athens and Sparta was developed and integrated into a new social studies curriculum entitled "Man: A Course of Study." It is also supporting the development of a major unit on the Mexican-American Culture by Educational Systems Corporation.

The Humanities Endowment has also funded several "state of the art studies" in the humanities fields recently. One has created a Commission on Humanities in the Schools which is attempting to find out how the humanities are presently being taught in the elementary and secondary schools and what unusual experimental approaches might be of value to others; the other is a planning grant to initiate an interdisciplinary study of the arts in education cutting across all educational levels, K-through-adulthood. The latter, referred to as Project Arts/Worth, was proposed by the National Council for the Arts in Education (NCAIE) and is envisioned as a two-year project, its second phase to be concerned with national dissemination of the outcomes of the status study.

As the note at the bottom of the table indicates, additional (and unlisted) support for humanities education at the elementary and secondary levels has also come from the Endowment's Planning and Development Program. This Program has, since 1968, underwritten a broad-gauged activity referred to as The National Humanities Faculty; this is a project which enables representative schools throughout the country to receive assistance from prominent university humanists (and some outstanding artist-teachers who are not necessarily college-based). Essentially, the National Faculty members agree to travel, on request, to selected schools -- and once there, to counsel with teachers who want to make curriculum changes, to bring teachers up-to-date information on research findings and changing interpretations, and to conduct seminars and workshops on humanities teaching generally. That the faculty members are not all scholarly college humanists is attested to by the recent three-day visit made by Frank Wittow, the Director of Atlanta's Academy Theatre, to several schools in Baltimore County to conduct demonstration workshops with students using improvisational theatre methods to illuminate present-day social studies issues.

The Humanities Faculty Program has already received support amounting to $158,000 in 1968 and 1969 and, according to the NEFH staff, is in line for a continuation grant of between $150-200,000 out of the 1970 allocation.

Another significant grant made this year was the $10,000 awarded to Foxfire, a beautifully-designed quarterly magazine dealing with the folklore of the Southern mountains which is edited and produced by a small group of high school students in rural Rabun Gap, Georgia, under the supervision of an extraordinary young English teacher named Eliot Wigginton.

Another $30,000 matching grant has been made to continue the work of an organization called the Teachers and Writers Collaborative, a group of writers in different parts of the country who work cooperatively with English teachers to improve the quality of creative writing in high school classrooms. Their journals and diaries serve as the reporting forms for an unusual series of observations on the teaching of writing.

Should the $1.8 million transfer from the Office of Education ultimately come through, it is likely that the Humanities Endowment will also use its $900,000 share to broaden and extend existing programs. The staff indicates these funds will be used to expand the National Humanities Faculty Program, to enlarge the scope of curriculum development work at EDC and Educational Systems Corporation, and to assist CEEB in the advanced placement course in art and music, and other such projects. As appears to be the case with the Arts Endowment, the long delay in effecting the transfer arrangements has apparently made it difficult for the Humanities Endowment staff to plan carefully for the implementation of new projects with this additional sum of money. It would be distressing indeed if this mitigated the impact of funds which represent a larger one-year investment in arts and humanities education at the pre-college level than the Endowments have been able to allocate in their entire history (excluding the Arts Endowment's support of the Laboratory Theatre Program).

* * *

As I implied in an earlier section, I am of the opinion that some hard bureaucratic in-fighting has gone on the last year or so with respect to the two Endowments and the Office of Education. It seems to have taken place at the level of the Bureau of the Budget, where policies are given dollar signs, and the result suggests that the Endowments have won the battle temporarily. Whether or not the $1.8 million transfer is ultimately effected, it would seem that the Bureau of the Budget has decided that extra funds for joint programs should -- for the moment, at least, be administered by the Endowments (with the Office of Education's advice and counsel), rather than by the Office of Education (with the Endowments' advice and counsel).

Furthermore, with President Nixon urging a 100 percent increase in the budgets of both Endowments (and including, in his message, some strong references to the uses of the arts in educational programs), the Endowments seem to be taking the bit in their teeth. The Arts Endowment already received $100,000 of U.S.O.E. money last year, and is looking at the possibility of nine times that amount this year -- as is the Humanities Endowment.

Another straw in the wind is this year's conference of the Associated

Councils of the Arts which is scheduled for the latter part of May in St. Louis. Its these is "Youth, Education, and the Arts." As the national association representing the interests of the country's numerous state and local arts councils, ACA has obviously responded to a growing feeling on the part of its clientele that the issues linking the concerns of the arts with the concerns of education at the elementary and secondary level need urgently to be explored by all parties involved. The Arts Endowment, which was the major force behind the establishment and proliferation of the state councils and commissions -- and which has continued to provide partial support to them through its state assistance program -- has obviously not resisted this development in the slightest. In fact, it appears to have been supportive of the conference emphasis from the beginning. (On the other hand, it should be pointed out that the Arts and Humanities Program at U.S.O.E. has also been instrumental in this enterprise, and has actually supported it financially with a $48,000 grant to ACA designed specifically to underwrite most of the conference costs.)

At the same time, it is becoming increasingly difficult to distinguish between the school-related policies and programs of the two Endowments themselves. I am not so sure, for example, that one of the Arts Endowment's major educational programs -- its Poets-in-the-Schools Program -- could not, with equal justification, have been funded by the Humanities Endowment; this project certainly has a basic humanistic, as well as artistic, quality about it.

On the contrary, Project Arts/Worth, the Friends-Morgan Summer Program (a 1967 project which used the arts to teach academic skills to slum children), aspects of the Humanities Faculty's activities, the magazine Foxfire, and several other projects of the Humanities Endowment might well have been supported by the Arts Endowment.

Some members of both staffs readily admit that both the philosophic and operational outlines of the two agencies are becoming increasingly blurred -- and that programs in the schools are, in many respects, up for grabs. People with educational proposals seem, more and more, to submit applications to both Endowments rather than choosing one over the other because of a sharply defined Congressional mandate. Although the Humanities Endowment has felt a preemptory interest in the problems of education -- precisely because of its mandate to improve the teaching of the humanities in the schools -- it no longer appears to hold exclusive domain over the schoolhouse and the campus. Arts Endowment poets are moving in -- and they are merely the most obvious signs of change.

NOTE: The ACA survey of state arts agencies referred to earlier in this section has indeed been completed. It does not, however, lend itself readily to year-by-year expenditure analysis -- so the trend of funding for elementary and secondary education purposes is hard to discern.

It appears, however, that about \$2.1 million has been spent by state arts councils or commissions since 1966 for arts programs directed to school-age youngsters. A straight-line breakdown, based on this figure, suggests that the average four-year state expenditure for such purposes was \$42,000 -- or about \$10,000 per year!

The listing of sample programs is worth studying for the extraordinary variety of activities supported, if for nothing else.

## The Office of Economic Opportunity

When O.E.O. was launched by Sargent Shriver in the early days of the Johnson Administration, there were indications that certain aspects of its social action, youth employment and job training programs might draw heavily on the arts in their approach to the so-called "War on Poverty." It appeared for a time that the government might, at last, be planning to explore the possibility that the arts could be useful in meeting some of the urgent social and educational needs of poor people -- and of the children of the poor in particular.

Local community action agencies, in some cities and rural areas across the country, began early to emerge as sponsors of arts-oriented projects of all kinds: theatre groups, African heritage dance ensembles, jazz and ethnic music programs, and a variety of visual arts and film-making activities, along with numerous "cultural" programs. Head Start, the pre-school program designed to give poor children a chance to start off on an even footing when they enter first grade, shortly evolved a curriculum which -- in the best pre-school tradition -- contained a great many arts-centered activities. Many Job Corps centers provided classes in a wide range of arts and crafts work for its youthful trainees. And poverty-area teen-agers provided with part-time employment under the Neighborhood Youth Corps program often found themselves working in and around neighborhood programs concerned with the creative and performing arts.

Such early developments as these created the impression that O.E.O. was solidly committed to programmatic goals which, at the federal level, placed genuine emphasis on the arts as a vital force in reshaping the lives of the poor. The truth seems to be that its intentions were, from the beginning, considerably less than that.

In fact, by the fall of 1966, a representative of Mr. Shriver's office was forced to admit -- at the OE-sponsored conference on the role of the arts in meeting the social and educational needs of the poor -- that O.E.O. had funded few if any arts programs and showed little signs of doing so. In response to questions from such people as Budd Schulberg, Dorothy Maynor, and a representative of HARYOU-ACT's arts program (all of whom had tried to obtain O.E.O. support and failed), this official said: "Basically what you say is true -- there are no funds per se for these kind of programs."

Although individual community action agencies did, indeed, put money and effort into such projects, the moderate flurry of arts programming which resulted stemmed almost entirely from decisions made at the local level of CAP policy planning and implementation. And many of these agencies found the going rougher still following the Congressional uproar touched off when a community action theatre group in Harlem produced one of LeRoi Jones early plays which had strong anti-white overtones. It soon became obvious that whatever interest might originally have existed at O.E.O. for such activities, the commitment of the federal agency was in truth virtually non-existent.

There are, to be sure, CAP agencies around the country which continue to sponsor programs in the arts -- the Bronx Community Action Theatre, for example, and Seattle's Central Area Motivation Program -- but, nationwide, the percentage is minimal, the priority low, and the administrative procedures cumbersome. Of O.E.O.'s $2-billion a year budget allocation, about $380 million currently goes to the community action program for personnel and program needs. But without some kind of survey of the remaining 930 CAP agencies (over 250 have gone out of existence in recent years), it would be difficult to tell how many now operate arts programs of some kind in the inner cities or rural slums of America.

Similarly, it is virtually impossible to determine the amount of money which supported arts components in the Head Start curriculum, or paid poor youngsters (aged 14 - 17) the Neighborhood Youth Corps maximum of $37 a week to work in and around projects or organizations engaged in artistic pursuits. In the latter instance, we know that many NYC youngsters were employed constructively as assistants in the program of the Anacostia Neighborhood Museum, or as aides in the arts workshops, play-street activities, or film-making projects which many cities established as part of their summer youth opportunity effort in recent years.

The Neighborhood Youth Corps has been subjected to severe cut-backs in funding, however, and it thus appears that another national program of genuine value to those attempting to rehabilitate the poor inner city teen-ager is in danger. Its value for the arts developments in the inner city lay in its ability to engage neighborhood youngsters in constructive arts-oriented activities (work?) by paying them modestly for their services rather than trying to attract them to programs on a volunteer basis and finding that 'nobody volunteers'. Museums, storefront arts centers, film-making projects, touring theatre productions, artmobiles and jazzmobiles, and such activities as the New York State Arts Council's Ghetto Arts Program -- all made use of the availability of Neighborhood Youth Corps funds to engage these ghetto youngsters in work-and-learning situations which dealt with aspects of the arts. No one really knows how many of these youngsters were involved in arts-related activities, nationwide, but I suspect it was a consderable number; and I suspect, too, that such experiences gave them a view of life, and of themselves, which would never have come to them in formal educational settings as presently organized. Of all the O. E. O. programs which once were so proudly unleashed to combat the poverty syndrome, it seems to me in many ways that the Neighborhood Youth Corps may have been one of the most effective -- unspectacular, but highly effective -- and I am saddened at the thought that it may fade quietly away one of these years.

This coming summer, in spite of the cut-backs and the rather gloomy long-term outlook for the Neighborhood Youth Corps, it appears that there will be, in several cities, an intriguing new programmatic development concerned with the theatre arts. I am told that in Dallas a plan is being worked out whereby about 125 inner city teen-agers will be involved in a 6 - 8 week program at the Dallas Theater Center where they will be given intensive training in theatre and dance. The Theater Center will receive $21,000 for instructional and production costs, and the youngsters themselves will receive the basic NYC wage for some 30 hours of work-and-instruction a week. This is one of five such programs being conducted by the Labor Department (which administers the Youth Corps) in different parts of the country this summer.

Head Start -- which has been recently transferred from O. E. O. to the administrative domain of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare -- will probably continue to function about as it has, augmented by the Follow-Through Program, which is designed to carry the benefits of Head Start into the regular school system. The arts components of these pre-school and primary grade programs are difficult to isolate, however, and it may therefore be sufficient to note here that the best and most up-to-date information about early childhood education is being fed into these programs -- which suggests to me that the arts can't help but be somewhat involved in both the curriculum substance itself and in the teaching methods employed.

The Job Corps, also considerably curtailed and now being administered by the Labor Department, never was designed to train young people for jobs in the arts -- but many of its centers have, from the start, conducted classes in arts and crafts, music, ceramics, sewing, photography, lapidary, weaving, and the like. In almost every instance, however, these classes are regarded as avocational and extra-curricular in nature; in the words of a regional information director for the Labor Department, "the idea is not to teach a vocational subject but to help develop a hobby and contribute to a well-rounded individual." At one Job Corps Center in Texas, the monthly activity calendar includes such things as "trips to Dallas for symphony concerts, trips to Fort Worth for dramatic plays, trips to Six-Flags for entertainment, etc. The idea is to absorb a student's free time with wholesome diversion and worthwhile events."

In many ways, the attitude toward the arts in the Job Corps Centers seems similar to that prevailing in most other public agencies concerned with education and training: namely that experiences in the arts are leisure-time pursuits, valued mainly for their hobby or cultural enrichment aspects, but largely non-utilitarian and thus relegated to extra-curricular status for the most part. A series of reports from the Labor Department's Regional Information Directors is attached; it documents this attitude fairly completely in describing the scope and variety of arts-related activities currently available to Job Corps trainees.

In the summer of 1966, incidentally, some of the best paintings, drawings, sculpture and ceramic work of Job Corps trainees all over the country were brought together in an exhibit that toured the nation the following year. The statements attributed to each of the young artists bore eloquent testimony to the fact that involvement in the creative process helped greatly to reshape their lives in many instances. In its most basic form, this experience was not therapy or recreational at all -- but simply a way of getting to know one's self, of drawing on unknown inner resources, and of finding a measure of artistic success. One wonders what might have happened if the Job Corps Centers had actually offered these courses as genuine professional training in the several art forms rather than as a way for the trainees to occupy their leisure hours.

I remember seeing, too, a touching motion picture about a group of young boys and girls in a Job Corps camp who learned about wood-carving from a professional wood-carver who was also a highly skilled teacher. There have not been many such instances, unfortunately, but when they occurred they were memorable indeed.

* * *

Whether programs of this nature can be more truthfully described as social development than as education is a point that may only be of significance to program planners and theoreticians. Probably such programs at their best contain elements of both -- and their ultimate potential may, therefore, need to be studied carefully by both kinds of agencies.

There is little of fiscal significance in any of these programs, in so far as the arts in education generally is concerned. That is, whatever in the way of arts programming has gone on has not been susceptible to any genuine statistical or financial analysis -- and it is not likely to have any direct bearing on the shape of future O.E.O. or Labor Department programs, or play any influencial role in them.

In this connection, however, I should mention a report of a national study, recently completed by the Communications Foundation of Santa Barbara, California. This report deals with some of the issues raised by such arts programs as those sponsored by the Community Action agencies, and it relates as well to projects in the arts supported under Title I of ESEA -- and was, in fact, conducted under a grant from U.S.O.E.'s Arts and Humanities Program while I was on the staff there.

The title of the report is "The Arts, Education, and the Urban Sub-Culture," and it consists of two parts: the first is an annotated listing of some 320 storefront and neighborhood arts centers, together with 230 school-based arts programs supported by various titles of ESEA; the second part is an analysis, in narrative form, of the results of the study and includes speculation concerning the implications of this movement for the public schools.

## HUD's Model Cities Program

Although there appears to be little that relates to formal education in the arts components of HUD's Model Cities Program, it is nevertheless a development which merits brief mention here.

In an announcement late last fall, the Recreational and Cultural Advisor to the Model Cities Program stated that "of the 35 model cities that received HUD/MCA supplemental fund grants by June 30, 1969, 28 cities (or 80%) included in their first year action plans projects that attempt to increase and improve programs and facilities for cultural activities in the model neighborhoods."

The announcement went on to point out that ten of these 28 cities planned cultural arts centers -- or planned to establish committees to provide training and employment opportunities in the arts as well as entertainment and exhibits for model neighborhood residents. "At a minimum," the announcement concluded, "all 28 cities are attempting -- primarily through resident involvement in the planning process -- to improve on the amount of recreational and cultural programming for the model city area."

There is obviously no direct tie-in here to the major concerns being addressed by this report; these issues do, however, relate to the social development aspects of the arts which, in many ways, are themselves intertwined with some of the new approaches to education (both formal and informal) which are emerging from the crucible of the current urban school crisis.

For our purposes here, the apparently heavy emphasis on arts activities in this year's Model Cities projects is a development worth watching -- provided the Model Cities Program itself is able to survive the general tendency toward curtailment of federally-funded programs for urban areas.

## SUMMARY: PROBLEMS AND PROSPECTS

On May 22nd, Commissioner of Education James Allen (who, by the way, also holds the title of Assistant Secretary for Education in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare) spoke to the 1970 convention of the Associated Councils of the Arts in St. Louis. The convention theme was "Youth, Education and the Arts," and Dr. Allen addressed himself principally to a reaffirmation of his personal views about the importance of the arts in the education of American youth; these are views he has held for many years, and, in fact, systematically put into practice during his tenure as education commissioner for the state of New York by establishing and enthusiastically supporting a major Division of Humanities and the Arts within the state education department -- the first of its kind in the country.

The highlight of his ACA talk, for arts council representatives at least, appeared to be his announcement of the transfer of $1.8 million from the Office of Education's current budget allocation to the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities where, split evenly between the two endowments, it is being used for projects in which both agencies have a major interest. At the same time, Dr. Allen reminded his audience of the recent series of EPDA grants (totaling $1 million) made to five school systems for comprehensive approaches to in-service teacher education in the arts. Referring to both of these developments as dramatic proof of the Office of Education's fundamental belief in the efficacy of the arts-in-education cause, he went on to speak of the need to develop "a more humane education through the arts," and of the importance of the "new partnership" being forged between the institutions of the arts and the institutions of education as they sought new ways to work together in common cause. The cooperative arrangements established by the Office of Education and the Arts Endowment to put the transfer funds into imaginative arts-in-education projects exemplified, for him, the spirit of this new partnership -- in action at the federal level. The overall impression one got from the Commissioner's remarks was that all these developments somehow represented the beginning of a new era of expanding federal commitment to the arts as central elements in the process of education.

In some ways, I am sure, Dr. Allen is quite correct: new partnerships must be forged between the institutions of the arts and those concerned with education. But our views about the stage of development we are in with reference to such matters appears to differ somewhat. They depend, perhaps, on whether one views a glass with a middling amount of water in it as half full or half empty. I tend to think that what we are really witnessing is the end of an era, with respect to federal support for the arts in education -- an extraordinary era in which new arts institutions were created at the federal level, and the Office of Education emerged as a major federal agency when new educational legislation of unusual fiscal significance was enacted. Certainly, when one speculates that "a new era is beginning," it is probably logical to assume that a previous era has ended -- or is ending. But it is really the nature and quality of these 'beginnings' and 'endings' which concern me, and the potential time-lag which may be involved in the transition period.

Before I attempt to elaborate on these concerns, I want to summarize briefly what seem to me to be the major points raised in this review of federal programs supporting the arts in education. In essence -- and put as objectively as possible -- what the foregoing program analysis suggests is that the creative and performing arts have not exactly gone unrecognized or unrewarded in the nation's elementary and secondary schools these last five years. In terms of federal dollars actually expended in their behalf, this was a period in which astonishingly large sums of federal money were made available to local school systems for almost any kind of educational experiment or development imaginable, including a great many in the arts. The sums involved were of a magnitude few people would have believed possible a decade ago. Certainly, it would have been difficult, in 1960 (or even in 1964) to find anyone who believed that funds on the order of $362 million would have been spent on pre-college education programs dealing with the arts before the end of the decade.

As the five-year summary table on the next page shows, the great bulk of this support came from Titles I and III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act -- and of this, the heaviest investment by far was in programs funded under Title I.

## Estimated Pre-College Arts-in-Education Expenditures, by Federal Programs, 1966 - 70

| | FY 1966 | FY 1967 | FY 1968 | FY 1969 | FY 1970 | TOTALS |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ESEA | | | | | | |
| Title I | 57,500,000 | 83,800,000 | 56,400,000 | 40,000,000* | 30,000,000* | 267,700,000 |
| Title II | (10,000,000) | (10,000,000) | (10,000,000) | (10,000,000) | (10,000,000) | (50,000,000)** |
| Title III | 13,568,000 | 20,918,000 | 24,008,000 | 14,796,000 | 6,116,000 | 79,406,000 |
| Title IV (AHP) | 2,402,241 | 1,912,041 | 2,067,346 | 1,800,943 | 1,151,948 | 9,334,519 |
| Title V | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| NDEA | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| NFAHA | 500,000 | 500,000 | 500,000 | -- | -- | 1,500,000 |
| EPDA | -- | -- | -- | 1,200,000 | 1,000,000 | 2,200,000 |
| NEFA | 83,000 | 797,930 | 245,650 | 470,150 | 397,000*** | 1,993,730 |
| NEFH | -- | 190,650 | 87,060 | 400,266 | 293,490*** | 971,466 |
| TOTALS | 74,053,241 | 108,118,621 | 83,308,056 | 58,667,350 | 38,958,438 | 363,105,715 |

* Estimates based on incomplete information but indicative of projected trend for Title I. (See Note below)

** Rough estimates only, therefore not included in the Annual Totals.

*** Does not include $900,000 transfer of funds from USOE, completed in late May, 1970.

---

NOTE: The Fiscal 1969 figure for Title I, provided after the above was written, indicates that about $40 million (or about the amount estimated) was indeed spent for the purposes indicated.

JE (April, 1971)

Several brief observations should be made, incidentally, about this summary table. First, because of the difficulties in obtaining other than the most global national statistics for Title I expenditures, virtually all of these figures should probably be viewed as general approximations rather than exact calculations -- a point I trust was made sufficiently clear throughout the report. On the other hand, for the first three years under scrutiny, the totals are as accurate a representation of the funding picture as it has been possible to make, given the available data and the state and local reporting procedures involved.

Second, since the yearly figure of $10 million under Title II is the rawest kind of estimate, I have not included these amounts in the annual totals; by putting them in parenthesis, however, I am suggesting that one might justifiably include some part of the Title II expenditures in any broad estimate of ESEA's support of arts and humanities education.

Third, it should be kept in mind that the FY 1969 and 1970 figures for Title I are largely speculative projections of a trend I have sensed may be developing in the Art, Music, and Cultural Enrichment categories of this program. (The FY 1969 figures have yet to be released* -- and it will be at least a year from now before the FY 1970 figures are available.) To recapitulate briefly, the development I refer to has to do with a cut-back (quite justified, in my view) in "get-the-kids-to-culture" programs -- and a concern that some of the really worthwhile arts programs may inadvertently get caught in the same trap. I hope I am wrong, and that valid distinctions between these kinds of programs are being made by Title I planners and administrators, but my hunch leads me strongly in the opposite direction. . . . and the estimated figures I have used in the table for Title I expenditures in fiscal 1969 and '70 reflect this viewpoint.

---

* See Note on Table, page 119.

At the same time, it should be pointed out that support for such programs on the order of $30 - 40 million a year can hardly be sneezed at; it is only in relative terms (compared to the $83.8 million expended in fiscal 1967, for instance) that it appears modest. Relative to the support situation prior to the advent of ESEA in 1965, it is a princely sum indeed.

The figures for Title III -- the other ESEA instrumentality which has provided substantial support for arts in education projects these last five years -- also need further explanation. The separate report on Title III will explain in some detail how the various totals were arrived at; for the moment, however, I should point out that the figures for these five years can be regarded as reasonably close approximations of Title III expenditures, reflecting what appears to be a general downward trend in Title III funding for arts projects since 1968. One qualification in all this has to do with the kind of projects which U.S.O.E. officials "screened in" when they developed their original lists. About two out of every five projects (accounting for perhaps half of the total listed expenditures) appear to have been general-purpose projects in which arts components were included to a greater or lesser degree, rather than projects devoted exclusively to the arts. If these multi-purpose projects were excluded, therefore, the Title III expenditures for each of these years would probably come to about half that listed on the summary table.

The trend in funding arts projects and programs under both of these major ESEA titles, then, is clearly down -- and in the case of Title III very sharply down. My expectation is that support in the years just ahead will probably continue at about the same reduced levels -- for a number of rather complicated reasons. If anything, Title III support for arts projects may drop even further, now that the state educational agencies are administering the program and Congress has had a chance, this year, to complicate matters by combining this title with NDEA Title V-A (guidance and counseling). In addition to set-asides for this program, 15 percent of each Title III state allocation is mandated for projects dealing with the education of handicapped children, and 7 1/2 percent is reserved for state administration costs. All of these categorical limitations cut heavily into the amounts available for new projects, at a time when it appears that other educational needs will probably receive greater priority. Add to this the fact that projects in the arts do not lend themselves readily to objective assessment, and the growing feeling that they are often extremely costly on a per-student basis -- and you have a situation which does not look very optimistic with regard to support for school-based projects in the arts these next few years.

As for Title I, it appears that its total appropriations will increase steadily over the next several years, but that the state and local administrators who will largely determine how the money is spent are in no mood to spend a very large percentage of it on the arts. The reasons are similar in many ways to those I have indicated as applicable to Title III -- plus the fact that Title I has always been primarily concerned with the teaching of reading and other fundamental academic skills, rather than with the affective aspects of education which draw heavily on experiences, insights and concepts the arts are uniquely capable of providing.

What about future developments in support of the arts under other programs administered by the Office of Education -- the use of Title IV monies by the Arts and Humanities Program, for example, and the teacher education activities of the Bureau of Educational Professions Development?

I suspect that my observations about trends in these programs over the next few years have already been anticipated. In essence, I am of the opinion that, unless there are major planning actions under way in U.S.O.E. which I know nothing about, the prospects are dim that support of any real consequence will come from these programs in the immediate future. There are many significant and challenging tasks which might be undertaken by these programs, provided they receive adequate -- and constant -- funding; but it appears unlikely to me that the requisite budgets are apt to materialize in the immediate future:

- In a transitional year -- much of it between Commissioners -- the Arts and Humanities Program at U.S.O.E. has been subjected to the uncertainties of administrative reorganization within what was formerly the Bureau of Research (now NCERD). Its staff has been sharply reduced and, during this period when its role as a unit with the OE educational research arm is under scrutiny and new policies and goals are being forged, its operational program budget has been considerably curtailed. Its important function as the locus of vital advisory and consultative services to its constituencies in this field continues, of course, but to fulfill its leadership role effectively, it seems to me that it must ultimately be shifted to a position of broader agency-wide scope and responsibility -- presumably at the management, policy-making and development level of U.S.O.E. operation.
- BEPD (the teacher education bureau) is composed of ten or eleven separate units and will probably continue to receive adequate -- even increased -- funding for some time; however, the Basic Studies Program, which administered the projects serving teachers in the arts and humanities field (among a number of other concerns) is only one of these units and there is no certainty that the concerns of the arts and humanities will necessarily continue to be addressed in

future BEPD budget allocations. The $1 million it put into the five school-based "Arts Impact" projects announced in May was money that had been magically restored following a major budget cut; there seems to be no assurance that Basic Studies will continue to have funds available for this or any alternative purpose embracing the teacher education needs in the arts. In sum, while a few new efforts may be funded next year, this million-dollar five-school program reflects no particular continuing commitment to this aspect of teacher education.

* The $1.8 million transfer referred to frequently in this report is, so far as I can learn, an isolated action -- and in no way indicates a commitment on the part of U.S.O.E. to continue underwriting its endowment "partners" with additional funds for "joint efforts"; nor does it even indicate that sums of this magnitude might begin to be budgeted and (if approved) retained by U.S.O.E. for arts in education programs of its own devising.

Thus, despite the implications in Commissioner Allen's ACA address that all of these actions represent an emerging new commitment to expand the role of the arts and humanities in American education, to me it looks more and more like the end of an era with respect to these concerns. It could be, of course, that somewhere in the complex administrative structure of U.S.O.E. or DHEW, a task force is now hard at work on precisely such concerns and will announce, before long, a new program that resolves the seeming contradictions between the

Commissioner's hearty assurances and the lack of programmatic resources to back them up.

What, then, about the endowments -- and principally the Arts Endowment? The central fact here is simply that the Endowment neither is nor should be centrally occupied with the problems of education; nor, for that matter, is it presently equipped with the staffing capabilities to enter such a complex arena effectively. Since its mandate is different, its staffing competencies lie in other fields -- and they ought to remain so.

The Endowment's ties to education are genuine, nonetheless, and it should probably continue to develop the several kinds of educational out-reach which has generally characterized its activities to date.

Broadly, these activities have clustered, first, around a wide range of professional performances for school-age audiences, and second, around the development of a variety of approaches to the involvement of creative and performing artists in classrooms, workshops, and seminars where direct interaction with students is possible.

The Endowment's ability to conceive, implement, and administer imaginative projects in the realm of education will always be limited by its official mandate, it seems to me. Its allocations, to date, have been so inadequate that it cannot begin to meet the needs of even the principal tasks it has been assigned by Congress. Under these circumstances, therefore, I am unable to believe that anywhere near the support required for major educational break-throughs in the arts will ever be forthcoming from the Endowment's budget -- even if it does receive the doubling of funds requested by the President.

I need only point out, in support of this viewpoint, that -- without the transfer from U.S.O.E. this year -- the Endowment spent about $397,000 for its pre-college arts in education programs in fiscal 1970 (and $165,000 of that was for the Educational Laboratory Theatre Program alone). This enabled some valid and necessary educational activities to take place, but it can hardly be regarded as funding that is adequate to the dimensions of the problem.

The Endowment, by all means, should continue to divert some proportion of its funds to projects that relate professional artists and the institutions of the arts to the process of education -- perhaps as much as 20 percent of its budget might be effectively devoted to such purposes. But, otherwise, it seems to me -- unless it acquires a really major increase in funding and a staff trained to deal with the realities of public education in this country -- the Endowment should be providing its expert advice and counsel (about the arts) to the Office of Education rather than the other way around.

I might point out here that precisely the opposite approach ought to be taken, in my opinion, relative to O.E.O. and social development programs in the arts. I have tried to put my thoughts on this matter into an article entitled "Government, the Arts, and Ghetto Youth," which is due to appear this summer in the Public Administration Review.

* * *

In a recent article in Cultural Affairs magazine, Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare Robert Finch addressed himself to the concerns of "The Arts and Education". He describes a few of the arts projects supported by ESEA funds, and then goes on to say:

> "Innovative as these programs may be, no one of them is enough to assure the arts a fundamental role in education. We first need general community agreement on the importance of arts programs. Only then can the obstacles to their implementation be overcome. Not the least of these obstacles is funding. Already strained educational budgets are continually beset with competing priorities, but I would like to see arts programs in the nation's schools supported at the highest possible level."

A paragraph later the Secretary warns us that:

> "The Federal Government's role, however, is still supportive rather than primary, and we must look first to the resources of the states and the communities. At the state level, we are seeing increasing emphasis on the greater role arts in education should play as more and more states are creating arts and humanities divisions of the Departments of Education. Working with the state governments are the State Arts Councils .... now established in all fifty states...." (and so on).

As with Commissioner Allen, it is hard to quarrel with the Secretary's earnest and well-meaning approach -- but it is not difficult at all to become disillusioned with his view of reality in this matter. If, indeed, he really would like to see "arts programs in the nation's schools supported at the highest possible levels," he could hardly find a better way to postpone such a development than to "look first to the resources of the states".

No matter how desperately one might wish that the states would begin to commit some of their resources to such a cause, it appears highly unlikely that they will do so with any degree of adequacy or continuity in the immediate future; the situation with state administration of Title III is one indication; the insignificant use of Title V funds for these purposes is another; and the fact that only a handful of state education departments have actually established those arts and humanities divisions the Secretary talks about is another.

To be fair, several state education departments do seem concerned about this aspect of education -- Vermont, Rhode Island, Pennsylvania, New York, Oregon, among others; as a matter of fact, the New York State Board of Regents issued a major position paper earlier this spring calling for "a new humanistic emphasis in our schools," and describing a statewide experimental network of 12 school districts which -- under a proposed plan -- would redesign their programs with this emphasis as base. But few states have either the resources to commit to this kind of program development in the arts, nor enough belief in their importance to go much beyond minimal departmental staffing. (And New York's experimental plan was itself turned down by the legislature this year.)

As for the state arts councils, their situation is similar in most respects to that of the Endowment. Most councils receive minimal state funding for their mandated purposes as it is; a great many of them manifest a growing concern for the arts in education, but have been unable -- on the average -- to divert more than 10 percent of their annual budgets to such purposes.

What the smart, new breed of arts council executive directors may be able to accomplish has more to do with their behind-the-scenes ability to influence the direction of support provided by other funding sources than it does in trying to scrounge $10,000 a year of their own money for the arts in education. And if, in some way, they can begin to find effective ways of working with their state education agencies (that does not result in heightened competition for state funds), there is reason to hope that Secretary Finch may indeed be quite correct -- in the long run.

* * *

Under these circumstances, what kinds of things are likely to happen in the arts in education under federally-sponsored programs over the next year or so? My speculative list follows:

- Some states will continue a few Title III arts projects, and a handful of new projects will be approved here and there across the county -- in all, perhaps 25-35 projects may be operational next year, at a guess. Of those projects which are being terminated or have exhausted their 3-year period of federal support, most will be drastically curtailed or eliminated.

* Programs in the arts will undoubtedly be continued under Title I in poverty-area schools in urban and rural settings; how many, and how good they will be, no one knows -- but there is no question that many millions of dollars will be spent on such activities (perhaps up to the $30 million I've estimated for this year).

* Little in the way of research and development in arts and humanities education will be carried on unless OE's Arts and Humanities Program is given a new lease on life; some of the activities in this field which are already under way (the curriculum development work at CEMREL, for instance, and the ES-70 Schools project) will certainly be continued, with assistance from other funding sources.

* The five "Arts Impact" projects, funded under EPDA and concerned with in-service teacher training, will be in their first year of a two-year support-period next year; otherwise, I know of nothing in the works at BEPD which is designed to meet the needs of teacher education in this field; some additional in-service training will certainly be conducted

in projects supported by non-federal funds.

- The Endowment for the Arts will probably continue to allot a portion of its budget for educational programs, mainly concerned with professional performances for student audiences and with artists-in-the-schools projects; its $900,000 will be used partly to extend and expand such activities as these, and partly in projects which lead in new directions, such as the multi-year grant to the state arts council in Rhode Island for a comprehensive state-wide arts-in-education development program.

And this seems to be about it. The list is subject to error -- and I fully expect some developments to come out of nowhere shortly which will refute the rather gloomy picture my review of federal programs has led me to draw; if so, of course, it will be all to the good; I would rather have such things happen than be regarded as "an expert predicter of things to come".

* * *

And now it is time to turn to a consideration of some of the things which, in my opinion, urgently need doing in this field but seem likely not to be accomplished under existing federal programs and policies. I shall resort here to a brief listing of these concerns -- on the theory that each requires a great deal more investigation and documentation than I have so far been able to give them. The list, nonetheless, suggests some of the areas it might be fruitful to explore more fully in considering the larger implications of this study.

* The whole question of developing a major arts component in the pre-service education of teachers -- and principally but not exclusively the pre-school and elementary teacher. There is considerable ferment in this field at the moment (initiated by the work of the English infant schools, where the arts are a daily part of the educational diet) and the possibility exists that a few schools of education, or teacher training institutions, might be interested in considering a radical change in their approach to the education of elementary teachers. My article, "The Upsidedown Curriculum," in the Summer 1970 issue of Cultural Affairs, alludes briefly to this point

* The need to conduct a wide-ranging series of research and development activities which focus on the question of evaluation of programs concerned with the arts in education. Many people believe it really can't or shouldn't be done -- others think that it can and should; my own feeling is that some kind of major effort ought to be made to get some rational answers before anyone stakes out a strong position either way. A few researchers are working away tentatively at separate pieces of the puzzle --

and thousands of school systems are being asked for evaluations of their arts programs and activities but have virtually no idea how to proceed, if at all.

* A need to look much more closely at the implications for the schools of the neighborhood or "ghetto arts" programs which have sprung up across the country recently. Is it possible to duplicate, in school settings, the kinds of learning experiences young people find rewarding and self-actualizing in the best of these neighborhood programs -- or is it possible to move the educational system along alternate routes which routinely incorporate these programs?

* A consideration of the whole question relating to the uses of the arts as teaching tools in the classroom -- not necessarily for their own purposes, but quite frankly as devices for the teacher to bring into play when and as she needs to. This has a special relationship to arts programs in poverty schools -- and it also bears on the issue of pre-service teacher education.

* The possibility that a model might be developed in one of the states for effecting a workable, cooperative relationship between the state arts council and the state education agency -- leading to mutually-beneficial programmatic developments. (The Rhode Island project may develop into an important example here.)

- The possibility that a rational means of program planning and management in the arts in education might be developed using a systems analysis approach: the idea would be to see whether a computer model could be developed which would simulate a wide variety of strategies for intervention or funding of arts in education programs, with the possibility of determining their consequences over short- or long-term periods. (Such a computer model now exists and has been used in the field of drug abuse; it might have direct applicability for problems of policy in the arts in education field).
- A full-scale exploration of the relationship of the creative and performing arts to the problems school reformers are facing in their efforts to develop a more humanistic education. Moves are currently afoot in each camp which could lead to a host of cooperative working arrangements -- linking the values and uses of the arts to the development of environments for learning which embody both the cognitive and the affective aspects of a truely humanistic education; it is in the interrelationship of these two forces, it seems to me, that the most effective strategies may be found for moving the arts more centrally into the educational process. I have also touched briefly on this point in my Cultural Affairs piece.

- _The need to find a systematic way of training young community leaders (mainly those from ethnic minority groups) for positions as arts administrators in neighborhood arts programs._ It is possible that such training may have entirely different requirements from that offered to and needed by arts administrators preparing for jobs in more formal institutional settings, and should therefore be conducted in large part experientially in the context of a sound store-front or neighborhood-based program.

* * *

There are others, but these seem to me to be the major needs in this field that may not be tackled adequately or forcefully enough by public programs at the present time -- at any level of government. They are all of them issues which appear, however, to have specific applicability to some of the crucial concerns of both the institutions of the arts and the institutions of education as they explore new ways to work together these next few years.

*

# REFERENCES

1. Benson, Charles S., and Gutheric, James W., An Essay on Federal Incentives and Local and State Educational Initiative (The University of California at Berkeley, December, 1968), page 11.

2. A sample state report from North Carolina, entitled "Benchmarks," is attached to this report because it describes "Music, Art and Drama Projects" in some detail for the second year of Title I operation in that state.

3. Profiles in Quality Education: 150 Outstanding Title I. ESEA. Projects (U.S. Government Printing Office: Washington, D.C., 1968)

4. Another way of getting at examples of the kinds of arts projects supported under Title I is through an Office of Education publication which I have just come across, entitled "Looking and Doing: Special Programs for Disadvantaged Children". This is a listing which appears to have been compiled annually for Title I programs, and it has sample projects grouped under specific categories such as "Art," "Music," "Drama," etc. It would take considerable time to go through these annual volumes and dig out all the projects listed under a variety of art-form categories--but it might be worth while doing so in order to get a more exact handle on this massive Title I effort.

5. The $1.8 million transfer of funds from U.S.O.E. to the National Foundation was officially announced by Commissioner Allen at the ACA Convention in St. Louis on May 22nd. The arts-in-education activities to be supported by the Arts Endowment's $900,000 share includes a major grant to the Rhode Island Arts Council for a coordinated school program embracing artists-in-the-schools, professional performances for students, teacher workshops and seminars. It has the makings of an unusual experimental approach to these problems in a state which is small enough to have such a development make a major impact.